Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1961

No. 512

SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., INC., *Petitioner*,

vs.

COLUMBIA BASIN PUBLISHERS, INC.; HOWARD PARISH AND ASSOCIATES, INC.; HOWARD W. PARISH; JAMES M. BRYCE; KENNEWICK-PASCO TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 831; UNITYPO, INC.; INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION; WOODRUFF RANDOLPH; DON HURD; WALTER D. MARVICK; CHARLES M. LYON; HAROLD H. CLARK; JOE BAILEY; FRANCIS E. McGLOTHLIN; A. L. WILIE; SEATTLE TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 202; and ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL OF SEATTLE, *Respondents*.

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ALFRED J. SCHWEPPE
MARION A. MARQUIS
FREDRIC C. TAUSEND
657 Colman Building, Seattle 4, Washington

SIDNEY DICKSTEIN
DAVID I. SHAPIRO
1411 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

JOSEPH A. BARTO
611 Alaska Building, Seattle 4, Washington
Attorneys for Respondents.

McMICKEN, RUPP & SCHWEPPE
657 Colman Building, Seattle 4, Washington

DICKSTEIN & SHAPIRO
1411 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

LUNDIN, BARTO & GOUCHER
611 Alaska Building, Seattle 4, Washington
Of Counsel

THE ARGUS PRESS SEATTLE WASHINGTON

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1961

No. 512

SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., INC., *Petitioner,*

vs.

COLUMBIA BASIN PUBLISHERS, INC.; HOWARD PARISH AND ASSOCIATES, INC.; HOWARD W. PARISH; JAMES M. BRYCE; KENNEWICK-PASCO TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 831; UNITYPO, INC.; INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION; WOODRUFF RANDOLPH; DON HURD; WALTER D. MARVICK; CHARLES M. LYON; HAROLD H. CLARK; JOE BAILEY; FRANCIS E. McGLOTHLIN; A. L. WILIE; SEATTLE TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 202; and ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL OF SEATTLE, *Respondents.*

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ALFRED J. SCHWEPPE
MARION A. MARQUIS
FREDRIC C. TAUSEND
657 Colman Building, Seattle 4, Washington

SIDNEY DICKSTEIN
DAVID I. SHAPIRO
1411 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

JOSEPH A. BARTO
611 Alaska Building, Seattle 4, Washington
Attorneys for Respondents.

McMICKEN, RUPP & SCHWEPPE
657 Colman Building, Seattle 4, Washington

DICKSTEIN & SHAPIRO
1411 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

LUNDIN, BARTO & GOUCHER
611 Alaska Building, Seattle 4, Washington
Of Counsel

THE ARGUS PRESS, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

SUBJECT INDEX

	Page
Counter-Statement of the Case	1
A. Proceedings in the District Court	4
1. The Complaint	5
2. The Pre-Trial Order	6
3. The Trial	7
4. Proceedings in the Court of Appeals	8
Argument	9
I. The Alleged Violations of Section I of the Sherman Act	9
II. The Alleged Violation of Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act	15
Conclusion	19
Appendices	following page 20
Appendix A, District Court's Opinion (Annotated)	pages 1A to 39A
Appendix B, Circuit Court's Opinion (Annotated)	pages 41A to 65A
Appendix C Pre-Trial Order	pages 67A to 68A
Brief Statement of What Plaintiff Intends to Prove	pages 69A to 82A

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Allen v. Trust Co. of Georgia, 326 U.S. 630 (1946) 4, 15

Allen Bradley Co. v. Local Union No. 3, 325 U.S. 797 (1945) 12, 13

Bender v. Hearst Corp., 152 F.Supp. 569, aff'd (2 Cir) 263 F.2d 360 11

Cole v. Arkansas, 333 U.S. 196 (1948) 15

Comstock v. Group of Institutional Investors, 335 U.S. 211 (1948) 4, 15

DeJonge v. Oregon, 299 U.S. 353 (1937) 14-15

Fernandez v. United Fruit Co. (2 Cir.), 200 F.2d 414 14

Giordenello v. United States, 357 U.S. 480 (1958) 15

Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products Co., 336 U.S. 271 (1949) 4

Page

Great Atlantic & P. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Eq. Corp., 340 U.S. 147 (1950) 4
Irish v. United States, 225 F.2d 3 (9 Cir. 1955) 18
Just v. Chambers, 312 U.S. 383 (1941) 4, 15
Kotteakos v. United States, 328 U.S. 750 (1946) 13-14
Laird v. Air Carrier Engine Service, Inc. (5 Cir.), 263 F.2d 948 14
Miller Motors v. Ford Motor Co. (4 Cir.) 252 F.2d 441 11
Montgomery Ward & Co. v. Northern Pacific Terminal Co. (D.C., Or.), 128 F.Supp. 520 14
Nelson Radio and Supply Co. v. Motorola, Inc. (5 Cir.) 200 F.2d 911 13
Taylor v. Reo Motors, Inc. (10 Cir.), 275 F.2d 699, 704 14
Union Leader Corp. v. Newspapers of New England, Inc. (D.C., D.Mass.) 180 F.Supp. 125 9
Union Leader Corp. v. Newspapers of New England, Inc. (1 Cir.) 284 F.2d 582, ftns. 7 and 8, certiorari denied, 365 U.S. 833 (1961) 12
United Brotherhood of Carpenters v. United States, 330 U.S. 395 (1947) 14
Walker v. West Coast Fast Freight, Inc. (9 Cir.), 233 F.2d 939 14

STATUTES

Norris-La Guardia Act, 47 Stat. 70, 29 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.* 5, 14
Robinson Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 13(a) 5, 15
Sherman Act, 26 Stat. 209, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2 ..... 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15

COURT RULES

Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 52(a) 3
Supreme Court Rule 19 3

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1961

SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., INC., *Petitioner,*

vs.

COLUMBIA BASIN PUBLISHERS, INC.; HOWARD PARISH AND ASSOCIATES, INC.; HOWARD W. PARISH; JAMES M. BRYCE; KENNEWICK-PASCO TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 831; UNITYPO, INC.; INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION; WOODRUFF RANDOLPH; DON HURD; WALTER D. MARVICK; CHARLES M. LYON; HAROLD H. CLARK; JOE BAILEY; FRANCIS E. McGLOTHLIN; A. L. WILIE; SEATTLE TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 202; and ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL OF SEATTLE, *Respondents.* — No. 512

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

COUNTER-STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The petitioner, prior to March 14, 1950, owned and published the Tri-City Herald, the sole daily newspaper in the Tri-City area of the State of Washington (Pasco, Kennewick, and Richland), enjoying a monopoly position, until, on the date above mentioned, the defendant Columbia Basin News commenced publication as a daily newspaper.

The petitioner's Tri-City Herald "at all times material has been and continues to be the dominant newspaper in the Tri-City area" (Finding 157, App. A, p.

35A). The respondent Columbia Basin News "was in the position of challenger seeking to become established in the field as against Tri-City Herald already thoroughly established" (Finding 151, App. A, p. 34A). And since September, 1950, "the financial condition of the Tri-City Herald and Scott Publishing Company has continued to improve" (Finding 155, App. A, p. 35A). Moreover, it was frankly admitted in the court below, and is unqualifiedly supported by the record, that "the record in this case is uncontradicted that the Tri-City area is capable of sustaining two newspapers (Tr. 1446, 2968-2969)" (Appellant's Opening Brief in the Ninth Circuit, footnote, p. 58).

The trial court found as a fact, and the Court of Appeals affirmed as a fact, that in this context there had been a vigorous competitive struggle between the petitioner's established Tri-City Herald and the new challenger, the respondent's Columbia Basin News, but that the established paper continued to dominate, grow, and make money, while the respondent challenger remained in a definitely secondary position; and that none of the activities of the respondent challenger constituted any violation of the antitrust statutes as claimed by petitioner at the trial.

In essence the petitioner is complaining that its original monopoly in an admitted two-daily newspaper market has been challenged, and it seeks through this litigation to destroy a struggling competitor in order to reestablish its monopoly in that market.

Notwithstanding that the facts have been found against petitioner in both courts below, precluding any reexamination of the evidence here, the petitioner nev-

ertheless seeks review in this Court by shifting from its theory in the trial court to another not presented in that court, not factually supported by the record in any way, and rejected by the Court of Appeals below.

Wholly apart from these elementary considerations which would seem to warrant denial of the petition without more, petitioner makes absolutely no showing that it is presenting a case of sufficient national magnitude to engage the attention of this Court within the contours of Supreme Court Rule 19, relating to writs of certiorari.

The facts of this case are set forth in detail, first in the opinion of the District Court (Pet. App. B, 23-57), and again in the opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Pet. App. A, 1-22). For the convenience of this Court, we have annotated these opinions to the record (App. A, pp. 1A to 39A; App. B, pp. 41A to 65A). So annotated, these opinions make clear that the findings of both lower courts are supported by substantial evidence. The Court of Appeals not only failed to hold the findings of the trial court to be "clearly erroneous" within Rule 52(a) of the Rules of Civil Procedure, but affirmatively determined that the findings of the trial court were amply sustained by the evidence. The case having been expressly decided against petitioner on questions of fact, it is respectfully submitted that there is nothing here for this Court to review.

Despite the concurrent findings of the courts below, petitioner sets forth a series of carefully selected record references (Pet., 6-12, 16-23, 27-28) in an attempt to secure review. Petitioner does not tell this Court

that the 6,810 pages of testimony in this case consist of 4,025 pages of testimony from twenty witnesses whose demeanor and credibility only the trial court could properly evaluate, and 2,083 pages of deposition testimony (456 pages of which came from witnesses who also testified live at the trial), and, in addition, that there are 505 exhibits. What petitioner is really doing, therefore, is asking this Court to reconsider the entire evidence *de novo*, as though it had come before it in the first instance. Apparently, petitioner is unaware that the "concurrent findings of the two lower courts will be accepted [by this Court] without re-examination of the evidence." *Allen v. Trust Co. of Georgia*, 326 U.S. 630, 636 (1946); *Just v. Chambers*, 312 U.S. 383, 385 (1941); *Comstock v. Group of Institutional Investors*, 335 U.S. 211, 214 (1948); *Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products Co.*, 336 U.S. 271, 275 (1949); *Great Atlantic & P. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Eq. Corp.*, 340 U.S. 147, 153 (1950).

However, petitioner makes a far more serious error. In framing its argument to this Court, petitioner completely disregards the entire history of this litigation prior to its appeal to the Ninth Circuit. Thus, to grasp the complete invalidity of petitioner's arguments, it is necessary first to examine the proceedings below.

A. Proceedings in the District Court

Petitioner commenced this litigation in 1955, charging defendants with combining and conspiring together in violation of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act for the purpose of driving the Tri-City Herald out of business in order to create a monopoly for the Columbia

Basin News (App. A, 2A-3A).[1] The charge, if true, was a classic violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act and the case was tried on that theory (App. A, 2A-3A, 16A), the conspiracy to *monopolize* in violation of Section 2 giving rise to the Section 1 violation alleged by petitioner. The district court found that the Sherman Act conspiracy had not been proved and that no restraint of trade had resulted from the acts of any of the defendants (App. A, 37A).

1. The Complaint

Petitioner now asserts (Pet., 4, 14) that it alleged in its complaint that the respondents violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act "by combining, agreeing and conspiring to cooperate, among other things, in organizing and maintaining a group boycott of petitioner's business by circulation and advertising patrons." What petitioner does not tell the Court is that on February 16, 1959, defendants International Typographical Union (ITU) and Unitypo filed a motion for summary judgment in which they contended that the complaint alleged at least five separate and distinct conspiracies (Memo., pp. 17-18).[2] In opposition, petitioner's memorandum stated (pp. 6-7): "Any fair reading of the

[1] Petitioner also charged a violation of Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 13(a). The alleged Robinson-Patman violation will be discussed in Point II, *infra*, at pp. 15-19.

[2] The motion was predicated upon the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, 47 Stat. 70, 29 U.S.C. §101 *et seq.*, the existence of a "labor dispute" and the absence of "clear proof" of participation, authorization or ratification of the unlawful activities alleged in the complaint. 29 U.S.C. § 106. The motion was not heard until two weeks before trial and was denied because it appeared "that a genuine issue of fact may be present as to the existence of a labor dispute, and as to the existence of authorization, participation and ratification." The question of law was reserved until "after a full development of the facts upon trial."

complaint discloses that it states the existence of one single conspiracy involving an agreement between * * * the union defendants together with certain of their officers [who] have combined, agreed and conspired with Parish, Bryce, Columbia and with each other, with the intent of damaging the Herald so that it can and will no longer compete with the News and to secure a monopoly for the News in the daily newspaper publishing business in the Tri-City area." Petitioner further stated (p. 7) that the paragraphs of the complaint which might have caused confusion did not purport to describe the composition or objectives of the conspiracy but only the "activities, means and techniques of carrying out this single conspiracy," and that the allegations of the complaint were clearly framed to show "that such methods and techniques are 'in furtherance of *the* conspiracy [charged]' " (emphasis supplied).

2. The Pre-Trial Order

On July 24, 1959, the district court issued a pre-trial order directing counsel to file memoranda covering a specific list of items including, *inter alia*, statements of what plaintiff and defendants expected to prove. In compliance with this order, petitioner stated that there was but one conspiracy, *viz.*: a Parish-Bryce-Columbia Basin Publishers conspiracy, entered into in 1949 to destroy the Tri-City Herald in order to obtain a monopoly for the Columbia Basin News in the daily newspaper business in the Tri-City area; that Locals 831, and 202, the ITU and certain other union defendants joined that conspiracy *prior* to March 3, 1950, and that Unitypo became a party to it on or about June,

1950. See *Statement of What Plaintiff Intends to Prove*, pp. 2, 9-10, 11-13, submitted in response to the pre-trial order of July 24, 1959 (App. C, *infra*, pp. 67A to 82A).

3. The Trial

The trial began on September 8, 1959. In its opening statement, petitioner reiterated the contents of its pre-trial statement verbatim to show the conspiracy which petitioner intended to prove (Tr. 8-13).[3] The balance of its opening statement was devoted to a discussion of the acts in furtherance thereof. Defendants' opening statements were also addressed to that conspiracy.[4] The trial proceeded on that basis. All of petitioner's evidence was focused in those terms. In attempting to sustain its burden of proof, petitioner spent many trial days introducing evidence as to statements, events and circumstances occurring or existing *prior* to March 3, 1950, in order to show that Local 831 and ITU had joined the alleged Parish-Bryce-Columbia Basin conspiracy prior to that date.[5] Defendants also devoted a substantial portion of their case to evidence showing the non-existence of any pre-March 3, 1950 agreement and conspiracy.[6] Indeed, a vast portion of the testimony

[3] The abbreviation "Tr." refers to the record which was reproduced by Recordak process; the abbreviation "R." refers to the printed record.

[4] See, *e.g.*, Tr. 100, 105, 110, 112, 113, 122, 123, 124.

[5] Unless petitioner could show that, from its very inception, the March 3, 1950 strike of Local 831 against the Herald was an integral part of the conspiracy, and that its origin and purpose flowed from a pre-March 3, 1950 agreement between Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin News on the one hand, and Local 831 on the other, petitioner could not establish damages (Tr. 7161, 7167-7171, 7199-7200, 7215-7217).

[6] In view of petitioner's theory of the case, the district court suggested that both parties should be interested in putting in facts to show whether Local 831's wage demands were or were not unreasonable (Tr. 4616-

and exhibits would have been inadmissible if petitioner had adopted any other theory of its case.

The trial ended on November 7, 1959. On December 2, 1959, the District Judge delivered his opinion. He described the conspiracy charged (App. A, 2A-3A, 17A, 22A, 29A, 30A), and held that while there was evidence of *post-strike cooperation* between Columbia Basin Publishers and Local 831, that cooperation, being consistent with the separate lawful purpose of each of those defendants, was not, of itself, proof of a *pre-strike conspiracy* to obtain a monopoly between Parish-Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers on the one hand, and Local 831 on the other (App. A, 16A-18A, 20A).[7]

4. Proceedings in the Court of Appeals

In the district court, petitioner attempted to prove that Locals 831 and 202 (the Seattle Typographical Union), the ITU and certain ITU officials knew of and joined the alleged Parish-Bryce-Columbia Basin conspiracy prior to the March 3, 1950 strike. It failed to do so. In the Court of Appeals, *ignoring the conspiracy charged,* petitioner attempted to show that there existed some "conspiracy," but did not tell that court what that "conspiracy" was, when it came into existence or at what point each defendant joined it. Instead,

4618). All parties agreed, and subsequently stipulated as to the then prevailing ITU wage scales in Northwest area communities (Tr. 6651-6658).

[7] Petitioner now asserts that, during the trial, it "urged that the alleged Sherman Act Section 1 violation stemming from the group boycott should be considered as distinct from the alleged Sherman Act Section 1 and 2 violations based upon conspiracy or combination to monopolize" (Pet. 14). The only record reference which petitioner cites (Tr. 7291-7292) from a more than 7300 page record, fails miserably to support this assertion.

it lumped together Locals 831 and 202, the Allied Printing Trades Council of Seattle, the ITU, Unitypo, and all the union officials, called them "Union appellees," and treated the post-strike period as the inception of a new and different conspiracy. In other words, on appeal, petitioner asserted for the first time in the litigation that, since the district court found that Local 831 and Columbia Basin Publishers had "cooperated" *after* the strike had started, allegedly in order to deprive the Herald of circulation and advertising, the district court, on the authority of *Union Leader Corp. v. Newspapers of New England, Inc.* (D.C., D. Mass.) 180 F.Supp. 125, was compelled to find the existence of a group boycott between Columbia Basin and *all* the Union defendants and, hence, a *per se* violation of § 1 of the Sherman Act.

The Court of Appeals (App. B, 61A) affirmed the district court's findings (App. A, 37A) in terms of the conspiracy which, in the district court, petitioner charged, and which it attempted, but failed, to prove (App. B, 60A-61A).

ARGUMENT

I.

The Alleged Violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act

Petitioner presents two questions to this Court in a last ditch attempt to salvage its charge that respondents have somehow violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act. Questions Nos. 1 and 2 of petitioner's statement of "Questions Presented" are as follows:

Question No. 1:

"May a *labor union*[8] *(and its wholly owned profit corporation)*[9] combine and agree with an employer, one of two competitors in a market area, to organize and maintain a group boycott of the other competitor by the customers of such other competitor without violating Section 1 of the Sherman Act, even if it is assumed that such combination and agreement is not coupled with the exclusionary intent requisite to a Sherman Act Section 2 violation?" (Pet., 2) (emphasis supplied)

Question No. 2:

"May one of two daily newspaper publishing companies in a market area, which is seeking to force its competitor to merge or consolidate with it, and a labor union (and its wholly owned corporations), which is seeking to deprive the other competitor of its circulation and advertising patrons in order to force acceptance of a labor contract, lawfully combine and agree to deprive such competitor of its patrons by group boycotts and other joint activity without violating Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, merely because each was motivated by a separate, independent purpose?" (Pet., 2-3)

Evidently petitioner has now abandoned all hope of establishing the Sherman Act conspiracy charged (see *supra*, at pp. 6-9), and is asking this Court to grant certiorari on alleged proof of "a conspiracy" despite the fact that the conspiracy on which petitioner now relies is wholly different from that which was

[8] The "labor union" referred to is the International Typographical Union (ITU).

[9] The "wholly owned profit corporation" is Unitypo (App. A. 23A-24A. App. B. 49A). It may also refer to Howard Parish and Associates, Inc. which Unitypo organized in 1952 (App. B. 50A).

charged and on which this case was tried.[10] The first fatal flaw in petitioner's argument that the "facts found by the trial court require a conclusion that respondents violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act" (Pet., 14) is revealed by examining petitioner's assertion (Question 2) that both the district court and the Court of Appeals concluded "that in injuring petitioner the union and newspaper respondents were motivated by different purposes and therefore the two groups could not combine or conspire in violation of

---

[10]According to petitioner, "the [district] court found that the Union respondents and the newspaper respondents cooperated in depriving the petitioner of its circulation and advertising revenue" (Pet. 8). With this assertion as its jumping-off place, petitioner argues that the "facts found by the trial court requires a conclusion that respondents violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act for the trial court found that the newspaper and Union respondents cooperated in depriving Scott Publishing Co., Inc. of its circulation and advertising. Such cooperation included the organization and maintenance of group boycotts of the Tri-City Herald by subscribers and advertisers" (Pet., 14).

In making this argument, petitioner tortures the district court's findings (App. A, 15A, 20A), attempting to give them a meaning neither intended by the district court nor supported by the record. The district court found that cooperation "was established between Local 831 and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., Parish and Bryce * * *" (App. A, 20A), not between ITU and Unitypo and the newspaper respondents. It also found that "cooperation" was cooperation "to build the [News'] circulation and advertising and to establish a daily newspaper" (App. A, 20A), *not* cooperation to deprive the petitioner of its circulation and advertising revenue. So much is clear from the Findings of the court set forth in the petition itself (Pet., 8, 9, ftn. 7). As the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit held in *Miller Motors v. Ford Motor Co.* (4 Cir.) 252 F.2d 441:

> "It is not sufficient for the plaintiff to prove a cooperative effort . . . but it must be shown that the combination has the objectionable features which the act is designed to prevent. *Alexander Milburn Co. v. Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.*, 4 Cir., 1926, 15 F.2d 678, 682." 252 F.2d 446.

See also *Bender v. Hearst Corp.* (D.C., Conn.), 152 F.Supp. 569, 578, aff'd (2 Cir.) 263 F.2d 360. In the instant case, the district court expressly found that there was no restraint of trade (App. A, 37A). The Court of Appeals reviewed that finding and affirmed it (App. B, 61A, 65A).

the Sherman Act" (Pet., 15). For neither court drew that conclusion. What the district court actually found was that the evidence of *post-strike cooperation* between Local 831 and the News, being consistent with their separate, lawful purposes, was not, of itself, *proof* of a *pre-strike conspiracy* to obtain a monopoly between Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers on the one hand, and Local 831 on the other (App. A, 20A). The Court of Appeals affirmed the district court's conclusion in terms of the conspiracy charged (App. B, 60A-61A), and which petitioner attempted, but failed, to establish (App. B, 43A).

Petitioner makes the same argument in this Court (Pet., 13-15) which it raised for the first time in the Court of Appeals, and which the Court of Appeals rejected (App. B, 60A-61A). But even if, as petitioner contends, the district court's finding of post-strike "cooperation" had been a finding of "cooperation" to deprive the Herald of circulation and advertising (Pet., 8, 14), and even if that issue could properly be presented in this case, that finding would in no way compel the conclusion that a violation of the Sherman Act existed. *Union Leader Corp. v. Newspapers of New England, Inc.* (1 Cir.) 284 F.2d 582, 585, ftns. 7 and 8, certiorari denied, 365 U.S. 833 (1961). In this case, it could not be said that Local 831 lost its antitrust immunity by aiding and abetting non-labor groups in violating the Sherman Act. *Allen Bradley Co. v. Local Union No. 3*, 325 U.S. 797, 810 (1945).[11]

[11]Under *Allen Bradley*, a labor union is liable under the Sherman Act only if it joins with an employer or group of employers who are themselves violating the Sherman Act independently of the union (325 U.S., at 809-811). Therefore, while *Allen Bradley* may apply to cases in-

Aware of the second fatal flaw in its argument, petitioner has framed Question No. 1 of its statement of "Questions Presented" in a patently contrived attempt to correct it. As there set forth, that question is, whether a labor union (in this instance the ITU) and its wholly owned profit corporation (Unitypo) could "combine and agree with *an employer*, one of two competitors in a market area, to organize and maintain a group boycott of the other competitor * * *" (Pet., 2) (emphasis supplied). Therefore, what petitioner really wants this Court to do, is to convert the district court's finding that Local 831 "cooperated" with Columbia Basin Publishers after the strike had started (Pet., 8, 14), into proof of participation by Local 831 in the employer's conspiracy with itself (App. A, 15A, 20A), and then substitute for Local 831's participation in that "conspiracy," the ITU, Unitypo and all the other union defendants. That, of course, cannot be done. *Kotteakos v.*

---

volving *one* employer and a union where a Section 2 violation is involved (because a *single* employer can violate Section 2), the *Allen Bradley* distinction between a union acting "alone" or "in combination with business groups" (325 U.S. at 810-811) requires in Section 1 cases a separate conspiracy between employers (because a single employer cannot violate Section 1). However, the very findings on which petitioner relies (Pet., 14), to establish "conspiracy" (Pet., 8, ftn. 7), are findings of "cooperation" between Local 831 on the one hand, and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. [and] Parish and Bryce (App. A, 15A, 20A) on the other. Since "Parish and Bryce" were officers and employees of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. (App. A, 8A), petitioner must conclude from the findings on "cooperation" that there was a separate conspiracy between Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. and its officers and employees in violation of Section 1, or, in other words, that Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. conspired with itself. *Nelson Radio and Supply Co. v. Motorola, Inc.* (5 Cir.) 200 F.2d 911, 914. Obviously, Local 831's participation in a "conspiracy" with Columbia Basin Publishers *alone* does not in this case satisfy the *separate conspiracy* between non-labor groups requirement of *Allen Bradley*.

United States, 328 U.S. 750, 770-777 (1946).[12] And, in view of the "clear proof" requirement of Section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, 29 U.S.C. § 106, it especially cannot be done in this case. *United Brotherhood of Carpenters v. United States*, 330 U.S. 395 (1947).

Petitioner finds itself in this dilemma because the argument which it now makes (Pet., 13-15), and which it raised for the first time in the Court of Appeals, asserts a violation of the antitrust laws with which defendants were never charged, ignoring both the theory of petitioner's case and the conspiracy which it charged in the district court.[13] Petitioner could not take the district court's finding of "cooperation" for a limited purpose after the strike (App. A, 15A, 20A), and use it to establish for the first time in the appellate courts a violation of the antitrust laws totally different from the violation which it charged, which it said it would prove at the trial, and which the district court found it had failed to prove (App. A, 37A).[14] Indeed, a holding that defendants had violated Section 1 on the basis of a conspiracy with which they were never charged, for which they had never been tried, and against which they had offered no defense, would have raised a "due process" problem of serious proportions. Cf. *DeJonge*

[12]Petitioner has been unhappily shuttling back and forth between different conspiracies ever since its opening brief in the Court of Appeals.

[13]Tr. 8-13; *Statement of What Plaintiff Intends to Prove* (App. C, *infra*, pp. 77A-82A).

[14]*Walker v. West Coast Fast Freight, Inc.* (9 Cir.), 233 F.2d 939, 941; *Taylor v. Reo Motors, Inc.* (10 Cir.), 275 F.2d 699, 704-705; *Fernandez v. United Fruit Co.* (2 Cir.), 200 F2d 414; *Laird v. Air Carrier Engine Service, Inc.* (5 Cir.), 263 F.2d 948, 953-954; *Montgomery Ward & Co. v. Northern Pacific Terminal Co.* (D.C., Or.), 128 F.Supp. 520, 524.

v. Oregon, 299 U.S. 353, 362 (1937); *Cole v. Arkansas*, 333 U.S. 196, 201 (1948); *Giordenello v. United States*, 357 U.S. 480, 488 (1958). Accordingly, since the district court's finding of the non-existence of the only conspiracy charged is supported by substantial evidence (App. A) and since that finding was affirmed by the Court of Appeals (App. B, 61A), petitioner's attempt to upset it should be rejected out of hand. *Comstock v. Group of Institutional Investors*, 335 U.S. 211, 214 (1948); *Allen v. Trust Co. of Georgia*, 326 U.S. 630, 636 (1946).

II.

The Alleged Violation of Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act

Petitioner argues that the courts below erred in failing to find that respondent Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. violated Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 13(a) (Pet., 24-32). The courts below held that there were no price discriminations by Columbia Basin News in the sale of advertising which had the effect of lessening competition or which tended to create a monopoly or injure, destroy or prevent competition (App. A, 38A, App. B, 62A to 64A). However, petitioner insists that "there were without question substantial price discriminations"[15] (Pet., 24) and

[15]In the court below, petitioner argued that price discrimination *alone* was sufficient to establish a violation of Section 2(a). Because the Court disagreed (App. B, 61A-62A), it did not deign to consider "the *claimed* difference relied upon by [petitioner]" (App. B, 64A). Petitioner now asserts that the Court of Appeals' failure to go into the details of the "claimed price difference" constitutes recognition by that court of the existence of "substantial price discriminations by the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., extending over the five year period from 1950 to 1955" (Pet., 24).

"there was a substantial diversion of business from the Tri-City Herald to the Columbia Basin News as the result of [that] price discrimination" (Pet., 27). Attempting to avoid the "concurrent findings" rule, petitioner argues first that the district court erroneously found that there were no price discriminations,[16] and hence never considered the question of competitive injury; second, that the district court's finding that there had been no competitive injury did not "afford the reviewing court . . . the semblance of an indication of the legal standard with which the trier of fact has approached his task" (Pet., 26); and finally, the standard which petitioner claims the trial court applied, namely, that throughout the period in question the Tri-City Herald remained and still is the "dominant newspaper" in the area, is an erroneous one (Pet., 26-27).

A reading of the pertinent portions of the district court's opinion (App. A, 34A, 35A, 38A), the circuit court's opinion (App. B, 61A to 65A) and the record references cited in support of those findings discloses the patent falsity of petitioner's argument. When two

[16]Petitioner contends that the court reached this finding because it was "deluded by respondents' bland assertions that there were no price discriminations" (Pet., 25), and refers the Court to Appendix F which according to petitioner "conclusively establish[es] price discriminations by Columbia Basin News" (Pet. App. 62). Petitioner fails to apprise the Court that the exhibits on which it predicates its assertion that "There were without question substantial price discriminations by the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc." (Pet., 24) were vigorously attacked as to their accuracy, truth and underlying assumptions, *e.g.*, the assumption that the News could unilaterally adjust its rate during the continued existence of the annual lineage contract, the assumption that an advertiser's annual lineage commitment meant that 1/12th of the total commitment would have to be used in each and every month of the year, etc. (Tr. 3635, 3675, 5602, 5626, 5630-5635, 5735-5760, 5857-5869). The attack was apparently successful (App. A, 38A).

courts have found as a fact that no substantial lessening of competition resulted from the alleged discriminations of respondent, and when those findings can be supported by careful documentation to the record, there can be no possible justification for petitioner's attempts to persuade this court to give any consideration to the alleged Robinson-Patman violation. By glossing over and confusing the precise findings and plainly stated reasoning of two courts, petitioner has attempted to construct a legal argument where none in fact exists.

The trial court did not simply make a general unsubstantiated statement that there were no price discriminations that had the effect of lessening competition (Pet., 24-25); its conclusion is a precise finding of fact (App. A, 38A), made in the light of the great emphasis which the trial court had previously placed on the competitive struggle between the News and the Herald (App. A, 14A, 21A, 30A, 31A, 34A, 35A) and its previous findings that the Tri-City Herald "at all times material has been and continues to be the dominant newspaper in the Tri-City area" (Finding 157, App. A, 35A), that Columbia Basin News "was in the position of the challenger seeking to become established in the field as against Tri-City Herald already thoroughly established" (Finding 151, App. A, 34A) and that since September, 1950 "the financial condition of the Tri-City Herald and Scott Publishing Company has continued to improve" (Finding 155, App. A, 35A). That the circuit court found in the district court's findings sufficient clarity and definiteness to review them is demonstrated by the circuit court's own

discussion of the alleged Robinson-Patman Act violations (App. B. 62A-64A).

The appellate court clearly had a full understanding of the "factual basis for the ultimate conclusion" of the trial court. *Irish v. United States*, 225 F.2d 3, 8 (9 Cir., 1955) (Pet., 26). This basis was not, as petitioner claims, merely that the Herald remained the "dominant" newspaper in the area. In finding that competition had not been lessened, the circuit and district courts considered market dominance as only one factor and relied on the entire nine-year competition between the two newspapers, during which time the Tri-City Herald continued to grow in strength, constantly gaining both circulation and advertising, while the defendant Columbia Basin News struggled to survive as the second newspaper in the area. Defendant's exhibit 376 alone, printed as part of the circuit court's opinion (App. B, 63A-64A), is in itself sufficient evidence to substantiate the findings of both the trial and appellate courts.[17]

Apart from the abundant direct evidence in the record supporting the "concurrent findings" (App. A,

[17]Neither court below attempted a separate analysis of each of the many hundreds of claimed price differences. In each instance, such analysis would have required consideration of such factors as (1) propriety of classification (*e.g.*, local advertising versus national advertising, eleemosynary organizations versus profit making organizations; (2) propriety of lineage combination for chain enterprises; (3) contractual commitments made prior to a general rate change; (4) clerical errors; (5) free runs against incorrect advertisements; (6) cost savings resulting from the reuse of previously set copy; (7) cost savings resulting from the use of customer provided mats; (8) cost savings resulting from advance lineage commitments—and many more. Rather than engage in this pointless exercise both courts found that there were no price discriminations which had the effect proscribed by the statute (App. A, 38A, App. B, 64A).

38A, App. B, 63A-64A), it is equally clear that much of the evidence upon which petitioner relies (Pet., 27-28) does not support its assertion that business was diverted from the Herald to the News as a result of price discrimination. While it is true that petitioner's officers, Philip and Lee (whom petitioner seeks to disguise as "one qualified witness") (Pet., 27) did so testify (Tr. 261-262, 2961, 3560, 3106-3107, 3492), at other points Lee himself testified to the contrary (Tr. 2890-2891, 2956-2959, 3110-3112, 3617-3618). The trial court was entitled to disregard that testimony as the testimony of interested parties whose credibility was sharply challenged and, as the district judge himself pointed out, because it consisted of highly speculative conclusions (Tr. 2962-2965). It is obvious that the circuit court accepted the district court's evaluation of such testimony. For these reasons, petitioner's Robinson-Patman arguments do not warrant any consideration by this Court.

CONCLUSION

By reason of the foregoing, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

ALFRED J. SCHWEPPE
MARION A. MARQUIS
FREDRIC C. TAUSEND
657 Colman Building, Seattle 4, Washington
SIDNEY DICKSTEIN
DAVID I. SHAPIRO
1411 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
JOSEPH A. BARTO
611 Alaska Building, Seattle 4, Washington
Attorneys for Respondents.

McMicken, Rupp & Schweppe
657 Colman Building
Seattle 4, Washington

Dickstein & Shapiro
1411 K Street N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Lundin, Barto & Goucher
611 Alaska Building
Seattle 4, Washington
Of Counsel

Dated: November 17, 1961.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A, pages 1A to 39A
District Court's Opinion (Annotated)

APPENDIX B, pages 41A to 65A
Circuit Court's Opinion (Annotated)

APPENDIX C, pages 67A to 82A
Pre-Trial Order
Brief Statement of What Plaintiff Intends to Prove

APPENDIX A

DISTRICT COURT'S OPINION

Annotated to Record (Trial Transcript and Exhibits)

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, NORTHERN DIVISION

SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., INC., *Plaintiff*, vs. COLUMBIA BASIN PUBLISHERS, INC.; HOWARD PARISH AND ASSOCIATES, INC.; HOWARD W. PARISH; JAMES M. BRYCE; KENNEWICK-PASCO TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION No. 831; UNITYPO, INC.; INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION; WOODRUFF RANDOLPH; DON HURD; WALTER D. MARVICK; CHARLES M. LYON; HAROLD H. CLARK; JOE BAILEY; FRANCIS E. McGLOTHLIN; A. L. WILIE; SEATTLE TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION No. 202; and ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL OF SEATTLE, *Defendants*.	**OPINION** **No. 4030**

This cause came on regularly for trial before the Honorable W. D. Murray, United States District Judge for the District of Montana, sitting by designation in the Western District of Washington, Northern Division, without a jury, commencing on the 8th day of September, 1959. Appearances: Mr. Carl A. Jonson, of Messrs. Johnson, Jonson & Inslee, Attorneys at Law, Seattle, Washington, and Mr. Howard M. Downs and Mr. Robert D. Raven, of Messrs. Morrison, Foerster, Holloway, Shuman & Clark, Attorneys at Law, San Francisco, California, appeared for the plaintiff; Mr. Joseph A. Barto of Messrs. Lundin, Barto and Goucher, Attorneys at Law, Seattle, Wash-

ington, appeared for the defendants, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., Howard Parish and Associates, Inc., Howard W. Parish and James M. Bryce; Mr. Alfred J. Schweppe, Mr. Marion A. Marquis and Mr. Fredric C. Tausend, of Messrs. McMicken, Rupp & Schweppe, Attorneys at Law, Seattle, Washington, appeared for the remaining defendants, and Mr. Sidney Dickstein, of Messrs. Dickstein, Shapiro & Galligan, Attorneys at Law, New York City, New York, also appeared for the defendants, International Typographical Union and Unitypo, Inc.

The action was commenced in 1955. Defendants, in addition to those presently remaining in the case, were brought in and subsequently dismissed. Extensive pretrial discovery procedures were undertaken by both sides. The trial commenced before the Court, sitting without a jury, on September 8, 1959, and consumed two months. A record of over 7300 typewritten pages was compiled and over 500 exhibits were marked in evidence. During the trial much of the evidence was received over objection on reserved rulings, and several questions of law were presented. However, in considering the case after all the evidence was in and after able arguments by counsel for all parties, the Court has concluded that the case involves essentially a determination of the factual issues presented, and when that determination has been made, as it has, the law questions pass out of the case. In making the determination the Court has considered all of the evidence, including that which was received on reserved rulings.

Plaintiff brought this action under Sections 15 and 26, Title 15, U.S.C.A., charging defendants with conbining and conspiring together for the purpose of destroying and driving out of business the Tri-City Herald, a daily newspaper published by plaintiff in the Tri-City area of the State of Washington, in order to

create a monopoly for the Columbia Basin News in the daily newspaper business in that area, in violation of the anti-trust laws, and specifically Sections 1, 2, 13, 14 of Title 15, U.S.C.

[1] Scott Publishing Company, the plaintiff herein, is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington, on September 17, 1947, and since November, 1947, has been and still is engaged in the business of publishing The Tri-City Herald, a daily evening newspaper at Kennewick, Washington, and distributing such newspaper throughout the Tri-City area, as that area will be hereinafter more specifically referred to and described (R. 4-5).

[2] In the publication of The Tri-City Herald, Scott Publishing Company is engaged in interstate commerce. Newsprint is purchased from sources outside the State of Washington, national and international news is gathered and disseminated; national as well as local advertising is sold and published, and the Herald is distributed by mail and other means outside of the State of Washington (Pl. Ex. 388).

[3] The principal founders, officers and stockholders of Scott Publishing Company are Robert F. Philip, who has been president of the corporation since its formation, and Glenn C. Lee, who has been Secretary-Treasurer since the inception of the corporation. Glenn C. Lee has been publisher of the Tri-City Herald and Philip has assisted in its management (Tr. 145, 2834, Def. Exs. 377, 378). [4] Lee and Philip, though experienced businessmen in other fields, had no experience in the newspaper publishing business prior to their entering that field in the Tri-City area (Tr. 137-138, 2829-2831).

[5] The Tri-City area consists of the cities of Kennewick and Richland in Benton County, Washington,

and the City of Pasco in Franklin County, Washington, and the area surrounding those three cities. Formerly Pasco and Kennewick were small farming communities on the Columbia River, and Richland was nonexistent, but with the end of World War II and the advent of atomic energy, the Hanford Atomic Works was constructed and Richland was established on government land with government owned houses and buildings to house the workers at the Atomic Energy plant. In the fall of 1947, McNary Dam was constructed on the Columbia River at a point some 14 miles from Kennewick and additional dams were planned for the development of the Columbia Basin. Public power was available in the area and irrigation projects were established, all of which led to a substantial growth of the area in population and economic activity. By 1947, there was a population of around 50,000 in the Tri-City area, and its future economic potential seemed very great (Tr. 139-140, 141, 143, 1235, 5074, Pl. Exs. 3, 20, 21, 22, 489).

[6] In 1947, Lee and Philip, who were then in the import-export business, became aware of the Tri-City area and its potential for future development and learned that the Pasco Herald, a weekly newspaper, job printing shop and office supply business in Pasco, Washington, was for sale. At about the same time Lee and Philip became acquainted with one Hugh Scott, a man who had had some newspaper experience, and the three decided to form Scott Publishing Company, the plaintiff herein, and purchase the Pasco Herald, which they did, agreeing to pay the former owner a total of $80,000, plus the inventory. Scott Publishing Company took possession of the property on October 1, 1947. Scott ceased to be an officer and director of Scott Publishing Company in 1949 (Tr. 137-145).

[7] Scott Publishing Company operated the job

shop and office supply business and continued to publish the Pasco Herald as a weekly paper until November 13, 1947. The operation was a profitable one. The potential growth factors of the Tri-City area were such that Scott Lee and Philip decided that a daily newspaper would be successful in the area, and within a matter of weeks after Scott Publishing Company took possession of the Pasco Herald, publication of a daily newspaper was planned, and on November 13, 1947, the first issue of a daily paper was published. Initially the paper was published 5 days a week, but in January, 1949, a Sunday issue was added, and ever since, the paper has been published six days a week, excluding Saturday. The name of the paper was changed from the Pasco Herald to the Tri-City Herald when daily publication commenced (Tr. 147-148, 368, Def. Ex. 487a).

[8] The conversion of the weekly Pasco Herald to the daily Tri-City Herald was almost an immediate success, but it raised serious problems for Scott Publishing Company. The expanded operation required more personnel of all kinds, the opening of additional offices in Kennewick and Richland, additional newsprint, which at the time was difficult to obtain. The plant and press were inadequate to handle the publication of a daily newspaper. Skilled mechanical workmen necessary for the expanded operation were not available locally and had to be recruited from all over the Pacific Northwest and even further afield. Distribution of the weekly Herald had been by mail from the single Pasco office and the conversion to a daily required the establishment of carrier organizations and offices in the three cities. And ever present was the need for sufficient capital to carry on the expanded operation (Tr. 148-152, 158).

[9] Scott Publishing Company with great difficulty

met and solved the problems. Personnel were recruited and trained, additional offices were opened, and in 1948, in the late summer, a larger press was obtained, together with a building in Kennewick to house it, and at that time the Tri-City Herald moved from Pasco to Kennewick. However, the newsprint problem and the problem with respect to sufficient working capital remained (Tr. 148-152, 158-159, Def. Ex. 487a).

[10] The defendant Howard W. Parish is a man who spent most of his life in the newspaper business, a substantial part of it in and around the Pacific Northwest. He has had experience in all phases of the newspaper business, but predominantly in circulation and management. He formerly was publisher of the Seattle Star, a daily newspaper published in Seattle, Washington, until 1946, when it ceased publication. When the Seattle Star went out of business, Parish acquired a stock interest in The Craftsman Press, Inc., a large commercial printing establishment in Seattle and held the office of Secretary-Treasurer of that company (Pl. Ex. 102).

[11] Parish traveled throughout the State of Washington on business of The Craftsman Press, Inc., and became acquainted with the Tri-City area as a result of such travels. He acquired additional information concerning the Tri-City area by reading a report prepared by one Earl McCallum, an expert in the newspaper field with reference to the newspaper business in the Tri-City area. Furthermore, at some time prior to February, 1949, Scott Publishing Company had prepared a brochure advertising the Tri-City area and the Tri-City Herald which was to be used to attract national advertising. Because Scott Publishing Company was not equipped to print in color, and as the brochure was to be prepared in color, Scott Publishing Company had the printing done by The Craftsman

Press, Inc., in Seattle, and Parish became familiar with the data contained in that brochure and likewise met Lee and Philip in connection with their newsprint problem and also in connection with the printing of the brochure in February, 1949 (Tr. 200-201, 442-443, 730-734, 2836). [12] Parish also had acquired considerable information concerning the background of Lee and Philip and the Scott Publishing Company and the difficulties which they were encountering in the publication of the Tri-City Herald and particularly the financial problems with which they were faced (Tr. 207, 726-728, 2840).

[13] As a result of all this information Parish became interested in getting into the newspaper business in the Tri-City area. He acquired the financial backing of several substantial businessmen in Seattle and in April or May of 1949, he telephoned Philip and asked if Scott Publishing Company was interested in selling the Tri-City Herald. Philip informed him that they might be interested in selling if a price could be agreed upon. At that time the Scott Publishing Company was very much in need of additional working capital and Philip and Lee arranged a meeting with Parish at which they hoped to interest Parish in the purchase of stock in the Scott Publishing Company, or possibly sell him the Tri-City Herald (Tr. 201-203, 732-733, 2837).

[14] At the meeting Parish informed Lee and Philip that he was not interested in purchasing a minority interest, but stated that he was interested in purchasing the controlling interest or the entire property. Lee and Philip set the price of $410,000 for the entire company which Parish considered too high and he offered $250,000 and no agreement was reached (Tr. 203-207, 2837-2840, Pl. Ex. 4).

[15] As stated before, Parish was aware of the tre-

mendous possibilities of the Tri-City area. He was also familiar with the background of Lee and Philip, their inexperience in the newspaper business in contrast to his own wide experience in that business. He was likewise familiar with the constant financial problems which Scott Publishing Company was continuously struggling with, whereas he felt that he, through his associates, had ample financial backing, and because of all of these factors which seemed to weigh so heavily in his favor and against Philip and Lee, he believed there was a golden opportunity for him in the newspaper business in the Tri-City area (Summation of Findings 1-13). [16] At the meeting with Lee and Philip, when the purchase of the Tri-City Herald was discussed, Parish pointed out these things to Philip and Lee and stated that he would start a newspaper in the Tri-City area to compete with them and that they would end up by having to sell their newspaper to Parish at 5¢ on the dollar (Tr. 206-207, 2840-2841).

[17] Thereafter, in August, 1949, the defendant Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., was incorporated. The original incorporators were Parish, the defendant James M. Bryce, who is Parish's son-in-law, and John X. Johnson, one of the Seattle businessmen associated with Parish, and who subsequently furnished the principal financial support of the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., in its early days, together with several other Seattle businessmen (Tr. 780-781, Pl. Ex. 102).

[18] The Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., commenced publication of the Pasco News, a weekly newspaper at Pasco in August, 1949. The circulation of the Pasco News was on a free distribution basis. The publication of the Pasco News on a weekly basis continued until November, 1949, when publication was stepped up to bi-weekly, and at that time acquisition of the facilities to publish a daily newspaper was commenced (Tr. 723-

724, 740-744). [19] As a weekly newspaper the Pasco News competed with the Tri-City Herald for advertising within the Tri-City area and particularly in Pasco. However, at no time before Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., commenced publication of the daily Columbia Basin News, under the circumstances hereinafter set forth, had the Pasco News, either as a weekly or a bi-weekly, earned a profit (Tr. 769-770, 1456-1457, Pl. Exs. 45, 46, 161).

[20] Prior to August, 1949, members of the Typographical Union in the Tri-City area had been under the jurisdiction of the local Typographical Union at Walla Walla, Washington, which is some 50 miles away from the Tri-City area (Tr. 6367, 6369-6370).

[21] Because of this distance, members of the Typographical Union in the Tri-City area desired to form their own local and in August, 1949, the defendant Kennewick-Pasco Local 831 was chartered and affiliated with the International Typographical Union (Tr. 1635, 1637, 1827-1829, 6367-6368, 6370). At some time prior there had been a contract between the Typographical Union through the Walla Walla local with the predecessor of the Scott Publishing Company, but before Scott Publishing Company took over, that contract had expired and there was no contract concerning terms of employment between the Typographical Union and Scott Publishing Company (Tr. 146-147).

[22] After the formation and chartering of Local 831, and on December 2, 1949, Local 831 mailed notices to employers in the Tri-City area asking the commencement of collective bargaining negotiations. The employers notified were Scott Publishing Company, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., Husk Printing Company and Meverden Printing Company, the latter two being commercial job printing shops (Tr. 2842, 6373-6374, 6504, Def. Ex. 16).

[23] Lee, on behalf of the Scott Publishing Company, because of his personal feeling toward Parish, declined to join with the other employers in the area in meeting with the negotiating committee of Local 831 (Tr. 2844-2845). [24] Nevertheless the other three employers in the area, after several meetings with the Scale Committee of Local 831, one of which was attended by one Art Schmidt, President of the Seattle Local of the International Typographical Union and a Mr. Hudson of the Tacoma Local of the I.T.U., signed a contract fixing the scale for members of the I.T.U. at $90.00 a week for 38¾ hours work (Tr. 6509-6511, 6513, 6557-6558, 6563, Pl. Exs. 58, 176, minutes of Feb. 9).

[25] Originally the Union's demand was for $95.00 a week for 37½ hours work, which was the Seattle scale at that time, but this demand was compromised for the $90.00 figure and the 38¾ hours (Tr. 6507-6508, 6557-6558).

[26] Thereafter Local 831 commenced negotiations with Scott Publishing Company. Not getting anywhere with the negotiations the Local Union requested assistance from the I.T.U. and special representatives of the President of the I.T.U., Whiting and Marvick, came into the area and participated in the negotiations (Tr. 2749, 2846-2848, 3017-3019, 4586, 6436). [27] When the representatives of the I.T.U. appeared in the negotiations, Scott Publishing Company appealed to Pacific Northwest Newspaper Publishers Association for assistance in the negotiations and one D. S. Haines, Secretary of that Association joined in the negotiations on behalf of Scott Publishing Company (Tr. 2237-2238, 2851).

[28] The union people took the position that the only thing they could accept from Scott Publishing Company was the same contract which they had se-

cured from the other employers in the area (Tr. 2240, 4597, 4599, 4603, Pl. Ex. 176, minutes of March 4).

[29] Scott Publishing Company felt it could not pay the scale of $90.00 a week for 38¾ hours of work and likewise felt that certain provisions of the contract which had been signed by the other employers were illegal and therefore that it could not execute such a contract (Tr. 217, 2246-2247, 2250, 2855-2857).

[30] At that time the wages paid by the Scott Publishing Company were $80.00 a week for 40 hours work (Tr. 2245, 2857). [31] While the raise to $90.00 a week, which the Union demanded, was somewhat higher than was being paid in other comparable communities in the State of Washington, and the northwest, it was not an unreasonable demand for the Union to make upon Scott Publishing Company, particularly in view of the fact that the other employers in the area had agreed to such a wage (Stip. Tr. 6651-6658, Findings 24, 25). [32] After having secured such a contract from the other employers, the Union could not in fairness to them have accepted anything less from Scott Publishing Company (Tr. 4603, Findings 25, 29). There is no evidence that the other three employers did not enter such contract in good faith. As has been pointed out, Scott Publishing Company was given the opportunity to join with the other three employers in their negotiations with the Union, but had declined to do so (see Findings 22, 23 above).

[33] nor was there anything unreasonable in the Union's insistence upon a written contract with Scott Publishing Company (Tr. 4657-4658, 4682, 4841, 6375-6376) particularly in view of the fact that two employees of Scott Publishing Company, who had been active in the organization of Local 831, were discharged without apparent reason (Tr. 3169, 3171, 3175-3176, 6366, 6370, 6379-6387, 6549-6553).

[34] It likewise appears that in refusing to accept such contract Scott Publishing Company was acting in good faith. At the time of the negotiations the Tri-City area was in a depressed economic situation and it did not appear to Scott Publishing Company that it could afford to give the demanded increase without becoming bankrupt (Tr. 217, 373-374, 2855-2857). [35] Furthermore, Scott Publishing Company was advised by Mr. Haines that certain provisions of the contract demanded were illegal and subsequent litigation, many years later, concerning like provisions in other contracts indicated at least that Mr. Haines was not unreasonable in his belief (Tr. 2246-2247, 2250). [36] At any rate the court finds that both the Union representatives and the Scott Publishing Company negotiated in good faith on both sides but were unable to reach an agreement (Findings 22-35).

[37] When the negotiations broke down on March 3, 1950, a strike or lockout ensued (Tr. 2278, 2873, 4646, 4649, 6520, 6539-6540). Whether the rupture of relations between the Scott Publishing Company and its employees is a strike or a lockout is not clear. [38] The Local Union had taken a strike vote and had applied to the I.T.U. for strike sanction and had received the same (Tr. 4589, 4624, 6467, Pl. Ex. 176, Minutes Feb. 24, Feb. 27). [39] However, no date for a strike had been set and members of the Union on shift at the Scott Publishing Company, on the evening of March 3, 1950, on returning to work after lunch, found strangers performing their jobs (Tr. 4649, 6467, 6520, 6539-6540, Pl. Ex. 176). However, whether it was a strike or a lockout is immaterial in this case; because it is evident that [40] whatever form it took there would have been a severance of relations between the employer and employes when they failed to reach an agreement (Findings 22-35, 37).

[41] Before the strike or lockout occurred, it had become apparent to Scott Publishing Company that no agreement could be reached with the Local Union, and Scott Publishing Company, with the assistance of Mr. Haines of the Publishers Association, arranged to recruit non-union employees to produce the Tri-City Herald under strike conditions (Tr. 2288-2290, 2293-2295, 3043, 3049). [42] Likewise teletypesetter equipment was furnished by the Publishers Association which permitted production of the paper with fewer skilled employees (Tr. 2301-2303, 6067, 6071-6072, 6075-6076). [43] When the strike or lockout occurred, publication of the Tri-City Herald continued by these means (Tr. 2304, 2307, 2864, 2875, 3043, 3058).

[44] The fact that it was almost certain there would be a strike or lockout involving the Tri-City Herald was common knowledge in the Tri-City area before it occurred. Parish, Bryce and their associates in the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., were likewise aware of the strong possibility of labor trouble for Scott Publishing Company and the Tri-City Herald (Pl. Ex. 59).

[45] As has been pointed out, Parish and Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., moved into the Tri-City area with the intention of eventually publishing a daily newspaper in competition with the Tri-City Herald (Findings 13, 15, 17), and as early as the preceding November, had acquired sufficient plant facilities and personnel for that purpose (Finding 18).

[46] Therefore, when it became apparent that a strike or lockout was imminent at the Tri-City Herald, all that remained to be done by Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., in order to start publication of a daily newspaper, was to complete arrangements that had already been started for features, comics and so forth for a daily newspaper (Tr. 773-775, 874-875, Pl. Exs. 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69). [47] These arrange-

ments were completed and on March 14, 1950, 11 days after the strike or lockout of the Tri-City Herald commenced, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., commenced publication of the Columbia Basin News as a morning daily newspaper 5 days a week, and this was subsequently increased to 6 days (Tr. 817-818, 983-984, 990-991, 1456).

[48] Almost immediately after the strike or lockout started at the Tri-City Herald, Local 831 commenced strike activities against the Tri-City Herald. Picket lines were established, attempts were made to induce both readers and advertisers of the Tri-City Herald to cease doing business with that paper. "Do Not Patronize" lists of merchants advertising in the Tri-City Herald were distributed, radio broadcasts were made; other unions in the area were induced to discourage their memberships from patronizing the Tri-City Herald—in short all the traditional means of exerting pressure against an employer involved in a labor dispute with organized labor was engaged in (Tr. 2881-2882, 6399-6400, 6474, 6478, 6565-6566, 6568, 6575-6576, 6614, Pl. Exs. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12).

[49] With the appearance of the Columbia Basin News as a daily newspaper, a bitter competitive struggle commenced between the News and the Herald, and between the respective publishers, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., represented by Parish and Bryce, and Scott Publishing Company, represented by Lee and Philip (Pl. Exs. 78, 80, 81, 82, 88). [50] The News, being in the position of the newcomer and seeking to gain a foothold in the field against a thoroughly established paper (at that time circulation of the Herald was in excess of 12,000, and it had substantial amounts of local and national advertising) was required to undertake very expensive programs to build circulation (Tr. 4254, 5257, 5273, 5282-5293, 5462,

6628). [51] Circulation is the lifeblood of a newspaper because it is circulation that attracts advertising and it is from advertising that the principal revenue of a newspaper is derived (Tr. 1192, 1531-1532, 2932, 2952-2955, Pl. Ex. 80). [52] Special reduced subscription rates were offered, free distribution of the News over wide areas was accomplished, contests were run, delivery routes beyond the trading area of the Tri-City area were established, all in an effort to build circulation, and all of which was very costly, but very necessary and normal in the establishment of a new newspaper in an area occupied by an established paper (Tr. 948-950, 5282-5283, 5462-5463).

[53] The publishers of the News were likewise happy to take every advantage possible of the situation existing between Local 831 and the Tri-City Herald (Tr. 852, 863-864). [54] The Union on the one hand was interested in exerting economic pressure against Scott Publishing Company by causing a loss of business and revenue in any and every way it could in order to force Scott Publishing Company to meet its demands for what it deemed a fair labor agreement (Pl. Ex. 176, Minutes March 4), [55] and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., was interested in gaining all the business of Scott Publishing Company it could in order to establish its newspaper (Tr. 863-864, 1201), [56] and the two co-operated, not with the common objective of eliminating Scott Publishing Company from the field, but each with its own separate purpose (Findings 53, 54, 55).

[57] In the field of advertising Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., at the beginning of the daily publication of the Columbia Basin News, established a rate card which proved to be unrealistic, and rates actually paid by advertisers during the year following commencement of the daily publication were generally below the

rate indicated on the rate card (Tr. 576-577, 5775-5776, 5598). [58] Because of the News' low circulation in the beginning, relative to the circulation of the Tri-City Herald, it could not expect to charge and receive the same rates that the Herald received with its wider circulation (Tr. 3004, 3096, Pl. Exs. 2, 32, 145-160, 391, 491, Def. Exs. 352-357). [59] Again in the field of advertising the publishers of the Columbia Basin News were only too happy to take any advantage they could of the efforts of Local 831 to induce advertisers not to do business with the Tri-City Herald (Pl. Ex. 393, 400, 84, as explained at Tr. 972-975, 4777-4779).

It is these circumstances outlined above upon which plaintiff relies to establish a conspiracy on the part of Parish, Bryce and the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., to drive Scott Publishing Company and the Tri-City Herald out of the newspaper business in the Tri-City area and to establish a monopoly for the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. There is no direct evidence of such a conspiracy and, of course, direct evidence is not needed. However, all of the evidence in the case up to this point, it seems to the Court, is at least as consistent with a reasonable good-faith attempt on the part of Parish to establish a competing newspaper in the Tri-City area as it is with the idea of a conspiracy to drive the Tri-City Herald out of business.

[60] Parish saw and was attracted to the Tri-City area by the same rosy picture of the future of the area that attracted Lee and Philip (Findings 5, 6, 11, 13).

[61] He likewise saw Lee and Philip as inexperienced novices in the newspaper business, unfinanced and overexpanded (Findings 8, 9, 12). [62] He considered himself an expert in the business and believed he had sufficient financial backing to establish a competing newspaper (Findings 10, 13, 15).

[63] The evidence shows that the establishment of a newspaper against a monopoly newspaper in a given area is an expensive proposition under any circumstances (Tr. 4930-4932). [64] Parish realized this and believed he could establish such a paper at a cost of $500,000.00 (Tr. 777-779, 782, 785-787, 790-791, 808-811). [65] To hold that the fact of one entering a business under these circumstances is evidence of a conspiracy to violate the anti-trust laws is to thwart the very purpose of those laws and turn them into instruments for the protection of monopolies. Of course, it must have occurred to Parish that in the event he were successful in establishing his newspaper in the area, the result might be that the Scott Publishing Company would be forced out of business, but that is a normal, natural, everyday occurrence when inexperienced, unfinanced people are forced to meet experienced, adequately financed competition. Parish's statements to Lee and Philip, at the time he attempted to buy the Tri-City Herald, rather than indicating a purpose to violate the anti-trust laws and create a monopoly for himself were rather simply a prediction of what Parish believed would be the result of Lee and Philip attempting to compete with him in the newspaper business (Conclusion of Court supported by Findings 1-17).

[66] Plaintiff also relies on the circumstances of the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., contracting with the Local to pay higher wages at a time when it was losing money, the strike or lockout against the Tri-City Herald, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., going daily at that time, again when it was losing money, and the cooperation between Local 831 and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., as being evidence of the conspiracy charged against Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., and of the Local joining in that conspiracy. While all of these circumstances would be con-

sistent with plaintiff's theory of conspiracy if it were proved, they are likewise just as consistent with proper, legal, independent purposes and intentions on the part of Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., on the one hand and Local 831 on the other (Conclusion of Court supported by Findings 1-47, 60-65).

There is no evidence that Parish or Bryce had anything to do with fixing the demands which Local 831 presented to publishers in the Tri-City area. [67] Indeed, the evidence is that none of the Scale Committee or Officers of Local 831 were acquainted with Parish or Bryce at the time the demands were formulated (Tr. 6348, 6414-6415). [68] The demand for $95.00 for a 37½ hour week was fixed by the entire Union membership, and it was based upon the wages and hours then prevailing in Seattle (Tr. 4605-4608, 6507-6508, 6556, Pl. Ex. 176, minutes Feb. 9, Finding 25). [69] There is uncontradicted testimony, which the Court accepts that normally and customarily in negotiations between typographical locals and employers in smaller communities the scale prevailing in metropolitan areas is interjected and discussed and bargained for by the local unions in the smaller communities, and is in some instances achieved (Tr. 4605-4608).

[70] So, there was nothing unreasonable in the demands of Local 831 (Tr. 2276, 4600-4605, 6558, Findings 24, 25, 28, 31, 32, 33, 66, 67, 68, 69).

Nor was there anything unreasonable or sinister in Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., coming to terms with the Union. [71] In the first place, the demand presented for $95.00 for a 37½ hour week was not met, but there was a compromise of $90.00 for 38¾ hours, so to that extent negotiations did take place (Tr. 6511, Pl. Ex. 176, minutes of Feb. 9, Findings 24, 25).

[72] Perhaps, if Scott Publishing Company had chosen to join with the other employers in the area, including

Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., in negotiations with the Union, as it was invited to do, the presentation of such a united front by the employers would have resulted in further reducing the demands of the Union (Findings 23, 24, 28, 32). [73] Secondly, in view of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. and Parish's determination to get a daily newspaper started in the area, and their acceptance of the fact that they were bound to spend some considerable money in the process in any event, they no doubt considered it prudent in a business sense to come to terms with the Union in view of the highly unionized character of the area as shown by the evidence, and also in view of Parish's experience that newspapers usually fared badly in disputes with Unions (Tr. 775-779, 782, 790-791, 808-811, 863, 3904-3905, Pl. Ex. 91, p. 91s).

[74] The evidence shows that Parish used the strike or lockout at the Tri-City Herald as his signal to go into the daily publication of the Columbia Basin News (Tr. 852-854, Pl. Ex. 59, letter of February 25, 1950). Again while this would be consistent with the purpose on the part of Parish to drive the Tri-City Herald out of business and to establish a monopoly in violation of the anti-trust laws, it is equally consistent with the purpose of starting a newspaper with the bona fide intention of competing. [75] Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., were in the area for the avowed purpose of starting a daily newspaper in competition with the Tri-City Herald (Tr. 772-773, 778, 852-854, 912, 1446, 4873).

[76] Though they were still losing money in their biweekly publication (Tr. 769-770, 1455-1456, Pl. Exs. 47, 48, 49), when they saw their competitor with a strike or lockout on his hands, it was the most natural thing in the world to choose that time to go daily, and it is

also completely consistent with a bona fide attempt to establish a competing business enterprise.

As for the cooperation which was established between Local 831 and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., Parish and Bryce, that too was a perfectly natural result of the circumstances which existed at the time. [77] Local 831 and its members understandably were delighted to have a fair newspaper started to compete with what they considered to be the unfair newspaper (Pl. Ex. 176, minutes of February 9, 1950, 253, 484). [78] Not only did it furnish employment for Local 831 members (Tr. 861, 1749-1750, 6346-6347), [79] but it furnished also an additional lever to be used in the Union's attempt to pry an agreement from the Tri-City Herald (Pl. Exs. 253, 393, 400). [80] The publishers of Columbia Basin News likewise welcomed any assistance they could obtain from Local 831 in their attempt to build circulation and advertising and to establish a daily newspaper (Pl. Exs. 37, 40, 84, as explained by Tr. 854-864, 972-975, 4777-4779). [81] There was indeed cooperation between the two, but each acting for its own legal independent purpose (Findings 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80).

[82] After commencement of publication of the daily Columbia Basin News in March, 1950, and despite the assistance of labor unions in the area in furtherance of the strike or lockout against the Tri-City Herald, the losses of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., continued and increased (Tr. 1297, Pl. Ex. 161).
[83] To some extent the losses were those normally to be expected in an attempt to establish a daily newspaper against existing competition (Tr. 777-779, 782, 808-810, 4930-4933). [84] Not only was Columbia Basin News in competition circulation-wise with the Tri-City Herald, but because it was a morning daily newspaper, it encountered competition from met-

ropolitan morning daily newspapers which were circulated in substantial numbers in the area, and this competition from the metropolitan papers was in part responsible for Columbia Basin News' high circulation costs (Tr. 1234, 5240-5241, 5246, 5249-5251, 5287-5296 5326-5329, Def. Ex. 439). [85] It likewise appears from the record that the losses to some extent were the result of haphazard management. Parish, the experienced newspaper man, continued to reside in Seattle and continued his employment with The Craftsman Press, attempting to manage the Columbia Basin News from a distance (Tr. 744-745, Pl. Ex. 102).
[86] Later, in August of 1950, when an attorney for I.T.U. and Unitypo came to the area in connection with a loan, he reported that the minute book of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., was in proper form for the first few months, but had not thereafter been kept up, that Parish had no financial statement which he could submit; that no inventory of the physical properties had ever been made; that the books were in a most confused state; that it appeared that little or nothing had been entered since June of that year and that Parish had then in August put a new auditor in charge to try to bring some order out of the chaos existing (Pl. Ex. 102).

[87] Parish and his associates discovered that the Tri-City area was not the soft touch competition-wise that they had anticipated (Tr. 864, Pl. Ex. 161).
[88] Furthermore, the substantial financial backing which Parish had anticipated from his Seattle businessmen associates failed to materialize. The record shows that after their original investment, which was soon expended, that one John X. Johnson, a businessman of Seattle, was the only associate who contributed financial support to the Columbia Basin News, and his contributions were relatively small, two or three thousand

dollars at a time in order to meet payrolls and other expenses, and even Johnson, prior to his death in July, 1950, was becoming reluctant to invest any more money in the venture (Tr. 781-783, 785-786, 797, Pl. Ex. 40).

[89] By May of 1950, Parish inserted an ad in "Editor & Publisher," a trade journal, in an attempt to sell the Columbia Basin News, but without success (Tr. 680, 690-692, Def. Ex. 42).

[90] Later in that summer, Bryce contacted Glenn Lee of Scott Publishing Company in an endeavor to interest him in purchasing the Columbia Basin News, again without success, although Lee went so far as to make an appraisal of the Columbia Basin News' plant (Tr. 439, 1465-1467, 1470-1472, 3246-3253, Def. Ex. 362). [91] There was a subsequent meeting between Lee and Bryce, arranged by Dudley Brown, a Seattle newspaper man, at which Bryce attempted to sell the Columbia Basin News to Lee, but that attempt likewise resulted in failure when Bryce insisted that a condition of the sale would be that the contract between Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., and the Local Union be honored (Tr. 2935-2936, 3257-3264).

These attempts to sell out are again not consistent with a purpose or intent to drive the Tri-City Herald out of business for the purpose of establishing a monopoly in the area.

[92] The defendant International Typographical Union is a labor organization with its principal office at Indianapolis, Indiana, and having approxmately 110,000 members in some 800 local unions throughout the United States and Canada, and as such is engaged in representing its members through local unions in their relationship with their employers (Tr. 1619, 4286-4287, 4302-4303, 4307).

[93] As part of its activities, it aids members en-

gaged in a strike or lockout by granting funds to such members by way of special assistance and strike benefits. Funds are obtained through dues and assessments levied by the membership upon themselves (Tr. 2187, 4369, 6401-6403, Pl. Ex. 199).

[94] The governing body of the I.T.U. is the Executive Council, consisting of the President, the first Vice-President, and second Vice-President, the third Vice-President and the Secretary-Treasurer. Such officers are elected by the membership every two years (Tr. 1798, Pl. Exs. 199, 200).

[95] The defendants Woodruff Randolph, Don Hurd, Harold H. Clark, Charles M. Lyon and Joe Bailey were all members of the Executive Council during at least a part of the time here involved. The defendant Walter D. Marvick is a special representative of the President of the International Typographical Union in the State of Washington (Tr. 1618, 2062-2063, 2095, 2105-2106, 4286, 4573).

[96] Faced frequently with the situation where its members became involved in a strike or lockout with the publisher of the only newspaper in a given area, the I.T.U. adopted the policy of either establishing a paper of its own to compete with the monopoly publisher, or rendering financial assistance where needed to a publisher whom the I.T.U. considered friendly to establish or maintain a competing newspaper (Tr. 4311-4318).

[97] In furtherance of this policy in 1946, the I.T.U. formed the defendant Unitypo, Inc., as a corporation under the laws of the State of New York .The members of the Board of Directors of Unitypo, Inc., are the members of the Executive Council of the I.T.U., except for one, because of the requirements of the New York law that at least one director of a New York corporation be a resident of New York. The stock of Unitypo, Inc., is held by the members of the Executive

Council of the I.T.U. in trust for the membership, again with the exception of the qualifying share held by the New York director (Tr. 4316-4320, 4324-4330).

[98] Funds for the operation of Unitypo, Inc., are supplied by I.T.U. from its so-called defense fund which in turn is raised by assessments on the members of I.T.U. (Tr. 4323, Pl. Exs. 199, 200).

[99] Since its inception, Unitypo, Inc., has started newspapers in various cities in the United States and Canada, where members of the I.T.U. became engaged in a strike or lockout with a monopoly publisher (Tr. 4312, 4318, Pl. Ex. 338, pp. 129-143, Pl. Ex. 339, pp. lu-32u). [100] It has likewise rendered encouragement and financial assistance to publishers considered friendly and who were competing with the publisher with whom I.T.U. was engaged in a strike or lockout. (Tr. 4323-4326). [101] Where Unitypo, Inc., establishes a newspaper, it has been its policy to sell it to an independent publisher whenever the opportunity presents itself, and not to continue in the publishing business (Tr. 4461-4465).

[102] The defendant Howard Parish, from his experience in the newspaper business, was aware of the I.T.U. policy and Unitypo, Inc., and when the losses of the Columbia Basin News continued to mount and as financing became increasingly difficult to obtain, Parish obtained authority from the stockholders of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., to seek a loan of $25,000.00 from Unitypo, Inc. The resolution authorizing Parish on behalf of the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., to apply to Unitypo, Inc., for a loan was passed on June 15, 1950, but nothing was done to carry out the resolution until after the death of John X. Johnson in July, 1950 (Tr. 797, 820-825, 1462-1464, Pl. Exs. 56, 57).

[103] In August, 1950, Parish called Unitypo, Inc. at Indianapolis, Indiana, by telephone requesting financial assistance (Tr. 824-825, 1682). [104] Upon receipt of the request one Clarence R. Martin, an attorney for Unitypo, Inc., and I.T.U. was sent into the State of Washington to investigate the situation (Tr. 878,1682, Pl. Ex. 102). [105] When Martin arrived in Seattle in August the financial situation of Columbia Basin News was critical. Martin arranged for an immediate $10,000.00 loan in the following manner through the Seattle-First National Bank: the bank agreed to lend the $10,00.00 upon receipt of a note and chattel mortgage upon the Columbia Basin News' plant, which was immediately endorsed by the bank and assigned to Unitypo, Inc., which then reimbursed the bank (Tr. 889-890, 1685-1687, Pl. Exs. 94, 95, 102 103).

[106] The assignment to Unitypo, Inc., of the note and chattel mortgage was not recorded (Tr. 1091, Pl. Exs. 94, 95, 103). [107] The reason for this round about way of getting the money from Unitypo, Inc., to Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., and the secrecy which surrounded all transactions between Unitypo, Inc., and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., was the prior experience of Unitypo, Inc., and I.T.U. around the country of having the newspaper they sought to aid encounter advertisers' resistance when it became known that the Union was supporting the paper (Tr. 1777-1778, 2009-2010, 4324-4325, 4347-4348, Pl. Ex. 338, p. 89).

[108] The losses continued and the $10,000.00 was soon expended and it became necessary to seek another loan from Unitypo, Inc. (Tr. 1476, 1689-1690);
[109] at that time Unitypo, Inc., sent a man out to the Tri-City area to appraise the plant and equipment of Columbia Basin News and Unitypo, Inc., agreed to purchase the plant and equipment for $25,000.' , which

included the prior $10,000.00 loan, and lease it back to Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., with an option to repurchase (Tr. 878-879, 1933-1934, Pl. Ex. 102).

[110] This transaction was consummated on October 2, 1950 (Pl. Exs. 102, 103). [111] By November, 1950, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., was again in need of money and sought an additional loan from Unitypo, Inc. (Tr. 1485, Pl. Ex. 161). [112] On November 30, 1950, Unitypo, Inc., made an additional $25,000.00 loan and took as security a pledge of all of the stock of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. (Pl. Ex. 104). [113] Losses continued and Unitypo, Inc., again in February, 1951, made an additional loan secured by the stock of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., and thereafter continued to make unsecurred loans to Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., and by 1954, the indebtedness of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., to Unitypo, Inc., had reached almost one-half million dollars (Tr. 1692, 4437-4438, Pl. Exs. 101, 106). [114] At that time Unitypo, Inc., made demand for payment of the loans made in 1950 and 1951, for which the stock of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., had been pledged as security, or in the alternative that the stock be issued to Unitypo, Inc. This latter was done, but Unitypo, Inc., almost immediately transferred the stock to Parish and Bryce, who in turn redeposited the stock with Unitypo, Inc., endorsed in blank as security for the then outstanding loans. The stock still stands in the name of Parish and Bryce on the records of the corporation (Pl. Exs. 105, 107, 108, 109, 110).

[115] Still the losses continued and by December 31, 1958, the indebtedness of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., to Unitypo, Inc., had reached $1,178,000.00 (Pl. Ex. 116). [116] In addition, in 1952, Unitypo, Inc., caused to be organized the defendant Howard Parish and Associates, Inc., as a Washington cor-

poration and provided the financing to this corporation to enable it to purchase and remodel a building which was thereafter leased and used as a plant and office by Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. All of the stock of Howard Parish and Associates, Inc., except for qualifying shares, was held by Unitypo, Inc. (Tr. 1502-1506, Pl. Exs. 112, 113, 114).

[117] The overall management of Columbia Basin News was conducted through the years by Howard Parish until December 31, 1958 (Tr. 1743-1744, 4548).
[118] At that time the I.T.U. replaced Parish as manager of Columbia Basin News with Edward Byrne, who had formerly been publisher of I.T.U. and Unitypo, Inc., papers at Colorado Springs, Colorado, and Jamestown, New York (Tr. 716-722, 725-726, 6588-6589).
[119] At the same time James Bryce and Charles Parker, who had been one of the original incorporators, resigned as directors and officers of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., and were succeeded by Byrne as Vice-President and director, and Frank Cummings as Secretary-Treasurer and director. Frank Cummings is also Secretary-Treasurer of Local 831 of I.T.U. (Tr. 716-722, 6588-6589). [120] Parish still remains as a director, but has nothing to do with the management and Columbia Basin News has in effect become an I.T.U. operated paper (Tr. 716-722, 725-726).

[121] Funds for the operation of the News are supplied by the I.T.U. in the form of special strike assistance to Local 831, which in turn delivers the funds to the Columbia Basin News (Pl. Ex. 116). [122] Since I.T.U. has taken over the management of the Columbia Basin News the amount of the losses has decreased, but nevertheless the newspaper continues to operate at a loss (Pl. Ex. 161).

[123] From January 1, 1959, up to the date of trial, the deficits in the operation of the Columbia Basin

News, which have been made up by the I.T.U. through special assistance to Local 831, total $40,000.00 (Pl. Ex. 116).

[124] In the years after Unitypo, Inc., commenced financing Columbia Basin News, Parish and Bryce wrote many letters and reports to the Board of Directors of Unitypo, Inc., and the Executive Council of the I.T.U., reporting on the progress of Columbia Basin News and containing references to "driving Lee and the Scott Publishing Company to the wall," "forcing a merger," "beating Lee," and so on. Plaintiff regards these letters and reports as showing an intent and purpose on the part of Parish and Bryce to drive the Tri-City Herald out of business in order to create a monopoly for the Columbia Basin News, and as a communication of such intent to the I.T.U. and Unitypo, Inc. (See e.g. Pl. Exs. 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 87, 88, 89, 96, 97, 138, 189, 497). [125] While again such communications would be consistent with such a purpose if the purpose was otherwise shown to exist, they appear to the Court to be merely communications on the part of Parish and Bryce in the nature of a sales pitch to their financial angel in an effort to keep the money coming, and were no doubt received in that spirit by the I.T.U. and Unitypo, Inc. (Tr. 910-913).
[126] Because of the policy of I.T.U. above referred to, and the purposes for which Unitypo, Inc., was created, it is unlikely that such sales pitches were required in order to retain the financial support of the Columbia Basin News by Unitypo, Inc. (Tr. 4311-4316, 4435-4438, Pl. Exs. 336, 339, pp. 62s-65s, 1u-32u). [127] The record shows that in other areas throughout the United States and Canada I.T.U. and Unitypo, Inc., have expended considerable sums for the purpose of keeping a competing newspaper in operation (Tr. 4329, 4382, Pl. Ex. 339, pp. 1u-32u).

A further indication of the lack of the intent and purpose on the part of Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin News on the one hand and Unitypo, Inc., and I.T.U. on the other to destroy the Tri-City Herald so as to create a monopoly for Columbia Basin News, lies in the method in which the money was expended. [128] While the $1,178,000.00 that has been spent by Unitypo, Inc., in support of the Columbia Basin News up to January 1, 1959, is a considerable amount of money, it was expended over a period of almost nine years in amounts sufficient to meet the operating deficits as they occurred (Pl. Ex. 116). It would seem that if there was a purpose and intent to drive the Tri-City Herald out of the business and such a large amount of money was available for that purpose, success would be much more likely to be achieved by spending the money in a relatively short time to cut subscription rates and circulation rates to such a point that the Tri-City Herald would have been unable to compete.

[129] Another indication of the absence of such intent, particularly on the part of I.T.U. and Unitypo, Inc., lies in the fact that when Clarence Martin, the I.T.U. attorney, initially came to the area to investigate the situation, he reported to the I.T.U. and Unitypo, Inc., "Parish does not believe he has Lee worn down enough yet to buy him out at a reasonable price, but is encouraged by Lee's having asked Bryce for a conference. (Lee probably wants to buy out the Columbia Basin News, but apparently neither Lee nor Parish can get money enough together to buy out the other)" (Pl. Ex. 102). Despite the tremendous financial resources of I.T.U. and Unitypo, Inc., no offer was ever made to furnish Parish or Columbia Basin News or anyone else with sufficient funds to buy out the Tri-City Herald, nor was a request for such ever made by Parish, Bryce or Columbia Basin News (Tr. 1683-1687,

Pl. Ex. 102). [130] Had the purpose and intent to create a monopoly in the area existed, it could have been realized by the purchase of the Tri-City Herald at a considerably lower figure than has been expended to date (Tr. 202-208, 2838, Pl. Exs. 4, 116).

[131] Likewise significant as to the intent and purpose of Unitypo, Inc., and I.T.U. was the question which was put to the Board of Directors and Executive Council each time they were requested to vote upon another loan for Columbia Basin News, which was in effect "shall we advance additional money to continue publication of the Columbia Basin News?" (See e.g. Pl. Exs. 74, 75, 111, 188).

[132] The record also shows that periodically through the years, notices were sent by the Local Union of the I.T.U. to the Tri-City Herald offering to resume negotiations. Again such offers are not consistent with an intent to drive the Tri-City Herald out of business, because at any time Scott Publishing Company could have entered a contract with the Local Union and any damage being done to it competitive-wise, by virtue of the strike or lockout, would have come to an end (Tr. 2933-2934, 5134-5135, Def. Exs. 17, 18).

[133] In view of all these circumstances, the Court finds that the intent and purpose of Unitypo, Inc., and I.T.U., in first assisting financially the Columbia Basin News and later taking over its publication, was simply to keep in operation in the Tri-City area a newspaper to compete with the Tri-City Herald, and was not to drive the Tri-City Herald out of business for the purpose of establishing a monopoly (Tr. 4311-4316, 4435-4438, 4510, Findings 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101). The Court further finds that the purpose and intent of Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., at all times was to establish a newspaper in competition with the Tri-City Herald, and that accepting whatever financial

assistance Unitypo, Inc., or I.T.U. were willing to furnish is not inconsistent with that intent and purpose (Findings 16, 17, 45, 52, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 74, 75, 76, 125).

When Columbia Basin News commenced daily publication after the strike or lockout against Tri-City Herald began, a very bitter competitive struggle developed between the News and the Herald. As has been mentioned, the management of Columbia Basin News was very inept to say the least, whether because Parish, with all his experience in the newspaper business regarded Lee and Philip, the guiding lights of Scott Publishing Company, as unworthy competitors or otherwise, does not appear. [134] In any event advertising rates were set and a rate card published which proved to be totally unrealistic considered in the light of the circulation of the Columbia Basin News (Tr. 576-577, 5775-5776). [135] As a result it was found necessary to sell advertising at rates that were generally below those on the published rate card (Tr. 576-577, 5775-5776). [136] Such rates, while lower than those advertised on the rate card, were not unreasonably low as compared to the advertising rates of Tri-City Herald when the circulation of the two newspapers was considered (Tr. 3004, 3096, Pl. Exs. 2, 32, 145-160, 391, 491, Def. Exs. 352-357).

[137] Despite the fact that the rates initially established proved to be unrealistic, it was not until March 1, 1951, that the management of Columbia Basin News revised its rate cards and established rates more in accordance with reality (Tr. 576-577, 5598). [138] Thereafter the rates charged advertisers did not substantially deviate from the rates published on the rate card (Tr. 3003, 5601-5604, Pl. Exs. 145-156). Newspaper advertising rates are based on the amount of advertising done by the advertiser, the more adver-

tising inches used, the lower is the rate per inch. [139] After the establishment of the March 1, 1951, rate card, the only sales of advertising to advertisers at a rate lower than the minimum rate shown on the rate card were to advertisers using more space than the maximum shown on the rate card and the reduction was relatively the same based on inches used as shown on the rate card (Tr. 5601-5604).

[140] In January, 1952, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., commenced the publication of a weekly free distribution newspaper known as the Columbia Basin News Shopper (Tr. 1143, 2908). [141] The Shopper contained little else other than advertising, but did have some editorial content (Tr. 1143-1146, 1150). [142] By the Shopper, Columbia Basin News attempted to provide blanket coverage of the area, that is they endeavored to see that every home in the Tri-Cities received either the News or The Shopper, and combination advertising in the News and the Shopper was sold upon that basis (Tr. 1143-1146, 1152-1154, Pl. Ex. 78). [143] The publication of such a free distribution advertising edition is not uncommon in the newspaper business (Tr. 2997).

[144] C. C. Anderson Company, one of a national chain of stores, was the largest single advertiser in the area (Tr. 1144-1146, 1373). [145] Because of personal differences between the then manager of the C. C. Anderson store and Glenn Lee, the publisher of the Tri-City Herald, so long as there was another daily newspaper in the area, the manager of C. C. Anderson would not have placed any advertising in the Tri-City Herald and would have advertised in any event in the Columbia Basin News exclusively (Tr. 3177-3178, 3183-3184, 3189, 3444-3449, Def. Exs. 372, 488). [146] Because the C. C. Anderson advertising was placed generally on Fridays and resulted in an unbalanced

daily page production for the Columbia Basin News, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., agreed to give C. C. Anderson five years of free advertising in the Shopper in consideration of Anderson's advertising in the Columbia Basin News being spread over five days, and in consideration of the fact that C. C. Anderson was the largest single advertiser in the Columbia Basin News (Tr. 1144-1146, 1373).

[147] In any event the Court finds that none of the rates charged any advertiser by Columbia Basin News were unreasonably low as compared to the rates charged advertisers by the Tri-City Herald when considered in the light of the relative circulation of the two newspapers (Tr. 3004, 3096-3101, Pl. Exs. 2, 32, 145-160, 391, 491, Def. Exs. 352-357).

[148] Another practice engaged in by Columbia Basin News, with respect to national cooperative advertising is complained of by plaintiff. In cooperative advertising, a national advertiser, either a manufacturer or distributor of a given product, will cooperate with a local retailer in local advertising. An advertisement will be inserted in a local newspaper advertising the product and the manufacturer or distributor will reimburse the local retailer who inserts the ad for a portion of the cost of the ad. In cooperative advertising Columbia Basin News would issue double bills, one bill to the local retail merchant at his contract rate, based on the number of inches of advertising that he used in the Columbia Basin News, and this was the bill which the local retail advertiser would actually pay to Columbia Basin News. Columbia Basin News issued a second bill to the local merchant to be submitted to the national advertiser for reimbursement at the open rate which in most instances would be higher than the local merchant's contract rate. In this way the local merchant would receive reimburse-

ment for a higher proportion of the bill for the given ad than the national advertiser had agreed to pay (Tr. 1331, 1430, 1434, 3986-3993, 4197-4211, 4212-4228).

However, as has been pointed out, there was a bitter competitive struggle between the Columbia Basin News and the Tri-City Herald.

[149] Almost all of the devices, including the co-operative advertising practice, the publication of the Columbia Basin News' Shopper, the giving of more favorable rates to larger advertisers, and the free distribution of newspapers, used by Columbia Basin News in this competitive struggle and of which plaintiff complains, were at one time or another throughout the period here in question used by the Tri-City Herald in this competitive struggle (Tr. 2917-2920, 5586-5591). [150] In addition, Tri-City Herald used devices such as rebates to advertisers and payments of commissions to local advertising agencies on local display advertising to attract advertising, which were not used by Columbia Basin News (Tr. 3083, 3113-3115, 3120, 3129, 3132, 3136, 3149, 5149-5162, 5310, 5857, Def. Ex. 473). Plaintiff concedes that it engaged in some of the same practices as Columbia Basin News, but contends it has not done so to the same extent.

[151] The record bears this out, but it must be remembered that Columbia Basin News was in the position of the challenger seeking to become established in the field as against Tri-City Herald, already thoroughly established (Tr. 3087, 3483-3484, 3588, Pl. Exs. 2, 491, Def. Exs. 351, 376). Mention is made of the practices engaged in by the Tri-City Herald in the struggle, not because these practices would constitute a defense to Columbia Basin News' practices if they constituted a violation of the law, but merely to point up the fact that there was a bitter competitive struggle going on and that whatever was done by either

party in that struggle was done for the purpose of competing and not pursuant to a conspiracy to monopolize.

[152] Immediately after the strike or lockout commenced at Tri-City Herald and Columbia Basin News went daily, the Tri-City Herald lost both advertising and circulation revenue (Tr. 250-252, 2890-2891, 2956, Pl. Exs. 2, 383). [153] When the strike started, Tri-City Herald's costs increased by virtue of the high wages and overtime paid to the non-union labor imported to keep the paper in publication when the regular employees ceased their employment (Tr. 233, 3299, 3309, 3312-3315, Def. Ex. 487b). [154] However, as employees were trained and as the equipment which they had brought in was utilized, their costs returned to normal and below what they had been before the strike commenced (Tr. 3315-3317). [155] By September, 1950, cuts, which personnel who had remained on the job had voluntarily taken because of the financial problem created by the strike or lockout, were restored; and raises were granted officers the following year and the financial condition of the Tri-City Herald and Scott Publishing Company has continued to improve (Def. Ex. 487c). [156] Their growth has not been as rapid as it otherwise would have been, but any slowing of its growth has been due to the strike or lockout and also due to the competition afforded by Columbia Basin News and not to any conspiracy on the part of these defendants or any of them to drive the Tri-City Herald and Scott Publishing Company out of business and monopolize the newspaper publishing business in the Tri-City area (Tr. 2890-2891, 2956). [157] At any rate, the Tri-City Herald at all times material has been and continues to be the dominant newspaper in the Tri-City area (Tr.

3087, 3483-3484, 3588, Pl. Exs. 2, 491, Def. Exs. 351, 376).

[158] No advertising was sold in the Columbia Basin News or the Columbia Basin News Shopper, and no rates for advertising in either or both were fixed, upon any understanding or agreement that the advertiser would not advertise in the Tri-City Herald or any other advertising media in the area (Tr. 1203, 1373).

[159] The advertising and subscription rates of Columbia Basin News were not established at a level where they would tend to operate as a means or method to achieve a monopoly by excluding the Tri-City Herald from the newspaper publishing business in the Tri-City area and there was no intent on the part of the defendants, either individually or in combination to so exclude the Tri-City Herald from the newspaper publishing business in the Tri-City area (Findings 136, 138, 139, 147, 149, 150, 151).

Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1) provides:

> "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several states, is declared to be illegal; * * *."

Section 2 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 2) provides:

> "Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several states or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor. * * *."

Before there is a violation of these sections, there must be a contract, combination or conspiracy in restraint of trade, or a monopoly, or an attempt to monopolize or a combination or conspiracy to monopo-

lize. If an actual restraint of trade results from a combination, or if monopoly is achieved by an individual acting alone or in combination with others, the intent is immaterial, or may be inferred. *U.S. v. Patten*, 226 U.S. 525; *U.S. v. Masonite Corp.*, 316 U.S. 265, 275; *U.S. v. Griffith*, 334 U.S. 100; *U.S. v. Columbia Steel Co., et al.*, 334 U.S. 495. However, where no restraint of trade or monopoly results from the acts and conduct complained of, then the acts or conduct complained of must be accompanied by a specific intent to restrain trade or monopolize before there is a violation of Sections 1 or 2. *Swift & Co. v. U.S.*, 196 U.S. 375, 396; *U.S. v. Columbia Steel Co., et al., supra*, at 525.

In this case, the evidence does not show either an actual restraint of trade or monopoly, or the specific intent on the part of any of the defendants, either individually or in combination, to restrain trade or create a monopoly in the daily newspaper business in the Tri-City area.

Plaintiff also alleges violations of Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act (15 U.S.C. 13(a)), and Section 3 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 14), by defendants in the sale of advertising.

Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits discrimination in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them.

Section 3 of the Clayton Act makes it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to lease or make a

sale or contract for sale of goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or other commodities, for use, consumption or resale within the United States or any place within the jurisdiction of the United States, or fix a price charged therefor, or discount from, or rebate upon, such price, on the condition, agreement or understanding that the lessee or purchaser thereof shall not use or deal in the goods, wares or merchandise, machinery, supplies or other commodities of a competitor of the lessor or seller, where the effect of such lease, sale, or contract for sale may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

While there is considerable doubt in the Court's mind whether newspaper advertising is a "commodity" within the meaning of the Robinson-Patman Act, or "goods, wares, merchandise or other commodity" within the meaning of the Clayton Act, decision of that question is unnecessary in this case in view of the Court's finding [160] that there were no price discriminations by Columbia Basin News in the sale of advertising which had the effect of lessening competition or tended to create a monopoly or injure, destroy or prevent competition (Tr. 2917-2920, 3087, 3483-3484, 3588, 5586-5591, Pl. Exs. 2, 491, 492, 493, Def. Exs. 351, 376, 487c); and [161] that there were no sales of advertising, or prices fixed for advertising, upon any agreement or understanding that the purchaser would not advertise in the Tri-City Herald (Tr. 1203, 1373).

It is the conclusion of the Court that plaintiff shall recover nothing in this action and that judgment shall be entered in favor of defendants for their costs. This opinion constitutes the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law in this case, and counsel for defendants are directed to prepare, serve on counsel for plaintiff, and lodge with the Clerk a form of judgment in

accordance with this opinion, within 15 days from receipt of a copy of this opinion, and counsel for plaintiff is granted 15 days after service upon it of such form of judgment within which to lodge with the Clerk in writing any objections which it may have to the form of such judgment.

Dated this 2nd day of December, 1959.

/s/ W. D. MURRAY
W. D. MURRAY
United States District Judge

APPENDIX B

CIRCUIT COURT'S OPINION

Annotated to Trial Court's Opinion and to Record, Trial Transcript, and Exhibits

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., INC., *Appellant*, vs. COLUMBIA BASIN PUBLISHERS, INC.; HOWARD PARISH AND ASSOCIATES, INC.; HOWARD W. PARISH; JAMES M. BRYCE; KENNEWICK-PASCO TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 831; UNITYPO, INC.; INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION; WOODRUFF RANDOLPH; DON HURD; WALTER D. MARVICK; CHARLES M. LYON; HAROLD H. CLARK; JOE BAILEY; FRANCIS E. McGLOTHLIN; A. L. WILIE; SEATTLE TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 202 and ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL OF SEATTLE, *Appellees*.	No. 16,871 June 30, 1961

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Northern Division

Before: HAMLEY, HAMLIN and MERRILL, Circuit Judges.

HAMLIN, Circuit Judge:

Scott Publishing Co., Inc., appellant herein, in 1955 filed an action in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Northern Division, against Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., and others,[1] appellees herein, seeking damages under the

[1] Howard Parish and Associates, Inc.; Howard W. Parish; James M. Bryce; Kennewick-Pasco Typographical Union No. 831; Unitypo, Inc.; International Typographical Union; Woodruff Randolph; Don Hurd; Walter D. Marvick; Charles M. Lyon; Harold H. Clark; Joe Bailey; Francis E. McGlothlin; A. L. Wilie; Seattle Typographical Union No. 202; and Allied Printing Trades Council of Seattle.

provisions of 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 15 and 26,[2] by reason of certain alleged violations of the antitrust laws by appellees. After extensive pretrial procedures and the signing of a pretrial order, the action was tried before the court sitting without a jury. The trial judge rendered a judgment in favor of the appellees (defendants below), and appellant filed a timely appeal to this court from that judgment. Jurisdiction was in the district court by reason of 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 15 and 26, and jurisdiction is in this court under 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 1291 and 1294.

The opinion of the district court is reported as *Scott Publishing Co. v. Columbia Basin Publishers, et al.*, 180 F.Supp. 754 (W.D.Wash. 1959), and appellant, in the statement of the case contained in its brief, has set out portions of that opinion which it admits accurately portray the background of the controversy. The facts as set out below are taken in part from those portions of the opinion of the district court adopted by appellant as uncontroverted and also from other portions of the opinion of the district court as well as from the record.

[1] Appellant corporation was organized in the State of Washington in September, 1947, and since November, 1947, has been engaged in the business of publishing the Tri-City Herald, a daily evening newspaper,

[2] 15 U.S.C.A. § 15. "Any person who shall be injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee."

15 U.S.C.A. § 26. "Any person, firm, corporation, or association shall be entitled to sue for and have injunctive relief, in any court of the United States having jurisdiction over the parties, against threatened loss or damage by a violation of the antitrust laws . . . when and under the same conditions and principles as injunctive relief against threatened conduct that will cause loss or damages is granted by courts of equity, under the rules governing such proceedings . . ."

at Kennewick, Washington, and distributing such newspaper through the Tri-City area of the State of Washington[3] (R. 4-5).

[2] In the action brought by appellant Columbia and its co-defendants were charged with combining and conspiring together for the purpose of destroying and driving out of business the Tri-City Herald in order to create a monopoly for the Columbia Basin News in the daily newspaper business in that area in violation of the antitrust laws, specifically 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 1, 2, 13(a) and 14.[4] (Appendix A, pp. 2A-3A, 16A, Tr. 8-13,

[3] The Tri-City area consists of the cities of Kennewick and Richland in Benton County, Washington, the city of Pasco in Franklin County, Washington, and the area surrounding these three cities.

[4] 15 U.S.C.A. § 1, Sherman Act § 1. "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is declared to be illegal . . ."

15 U.S.C.A. § 2, Sherman Act § 2. "Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor . . ."

15 U.S.C.A. § 13(a), Robinson-Patman Act § 2(a). "It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce, where such commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States, and where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them . . ."

15 U.S.C.A. § 14, Clayton Act § 3. "It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to lease or make a sale or contract for sale of goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or other commodities, whether patented or unpatented, for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States, or fix a price

see also pretrial order of July 24, 1959 and "Statement of What Plaintiff Intends to Prove," printed as Appendix C to this brief.)

[3] The principal officers of appellant since its organization have been Glenn C. Lee, publisher of the Tri-City Herald, and Robert F. Philip, president of the corporation (Tr. 145, 2834, Def. Exs. 377, 378). [4] Lee and Philip had no newspaper experience before 1947 (Tr. 137-138, 2829-2831). [5] In that year they learned that the Pasco Herald, a weekly newspaper with a job printing shop and office supply business, located in Pasco, Washington, within the Tri-City area, was for sale. They associated themselves with one Hugh Scott, who had had some newspaper experience, formed Scott Publishing Company and purchased the Pasco Herald, agreeing to pay therefor a total of $80,000 plus inventory (Tr. 137-145). [6] Scott Publishing Company took possession of the property on October 1, 1947, and continued to publish the Pasco Herald as a weekly newspaper until November 13, 1947, when it began publication of a daily newspaper. At the beginning the Herald was published five days a week; but in January, 1949, a Sunday edition was added, and since that time the Herald has been published six days a week, Saturday being excluded[5] (Tr. 147-148, 368, Def. Ex. 487(a)). [7] While the Herald was a success almost from the beginning, appellant was not without problems. Additional trained

---

charged therefor, or discount from, or rebate upon, such price, on the condition, agreement, or understanding that the lessee or purchaser thereof shall not use or deal in the goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or other commodities of a competitor or competitors of the lessor or seller, where the effect of such lease, sale, or contract for sale or such condition, agreement, or understanding may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce."

[5] The name of the paper was changed from the "Pasco Herald" to the "Tri-City Herald" when daily publication commenced.

personnel, additional newsprint, an expanded plant and larger press, a carrier organization, and additional working capital were needed. As time went on, some of these problems were solved, although by the spring of 1949 there was still need of additional working capital (Tr. 148-152, 158-159, Def. Ex. 487(a)).

[8] Some time prior to the spring of 1949, Howard Parish, one of the appellees, became acquainted with the Tri-City area. He had spent most of his life in the newspaper business and had until 1946 been the publisher of a Seattle newspaper. Thereafter he had been an officer and stockholder of The Craftsman Press, a commercial printing company in Seattle (Pl. Ex. 102).

[9] In his activities with the Craftsman Press, Parish had met Scott and Lee and had become familiar with the financial problems they were encountering in the operation of the Herald (Tr. 200-201, 207, 442-443, 726-728, 730-734, 2836, 2840). [10] He became interested in getting into the newspaper business in the Tri-City area; and, after getting some financial backing in Seattle, he contacted Philip in May of 1949 to ask if the Tri-City Herald was for sale (Tr. 201-203, 732-733, 2837). [11] A meeting was arranged between Lee, Philip and Parish at which Parish stated that he was only interested in purchasing a controlling interest in the paper or the entire property. Lee and Philip put a price of $410,000 on the entire company, but Parish was only willing to pay $250,000. Consequently no agreement was reached (Tr. 203-207, 2837-2840, Pl. Ex. 4). [12] In August of 1949 Parish, his son-in-law James M. Bryce, and some Seattle businessmen incorporated Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., hereinafter called Columbia. This corporation commenced the publication of the Pasco News, a weekly newspaper, at Pasco. The publication was continued on a weekly basis until November, 1949, when the publi-

cation was changed to bi-weekly, and at that time the acquisition of the facilities necessary to publish a daily newspaper was commenced (Tr. 723-724, 740-744, 780-781, Pl. Ex. 102).

[13] During the summer and fall of 1949 there was increased labor activity in the Tri-City area. The typographical workers in that area had previously been under the jurisdiction of the typographical union at Walla Walla, Washington, some fifty miles away, but in August of 1949 the defendant Kennewick-Pasco Local 831 was chartered and affiliated with the International Typographical Union[6] (Tr. 1635, 1637, 1827-1829, 6367-6370). [14] Scott at that time had no contract with the union (Tr. 146-147). [15] In December, 1949, Local 831 mailed notices to employers in the Tri-City area asking the commencement of collective bargaining negotiations. These notices were sent to Scott, Columbia, Husk Printing Co., and Meverden Printing Co., the latter two being commercial job printing shops (Tr. 2842, 6373-6374, 6504, Def. Ex. 16).

[16] Lee, on behalf of Scott, declined to join with the other employers in the area in meeting with the negotiating committee of Local 831. This was by reason of his personal animosity toward Parish who was attending the meetings (Tr. 2844-2845). [17] After several meetings between the committee of Local 831 and the representatives of three employers who did participate, a contract was agreed upon fixing a scale for members of the I.T.U. at $90 a week for 38¾ hours work (Tr. 6509-6511, 6513, 6557-6558, 6563, Pl. Exs. 58, 176, Minutes of Feb. 9). [18] After this agreement had been reached Local 831 commenced separate negotiations with Scott. When no progress was made,

[6] The defendant, International Typographical Union is a labor organization with its principal office at Indianapolis, Indiana. It has approximately 110,000 members in some 800 locals throughout the United States and Canada.

Local 831 requested assistance from the I.T.U., and some special representatives of its president were sent into the area to participate in the negotiations (Tr. 2749, 2846-2848, 3017-3019, 4586, 6436).

[19] Scott appealed to Pacific Northwest Newspaper Publishers Association for assistance in the negotiations, and the secretary of that association, one D. S. Haines, joined in the negotiations on behalf of Scott (Tr. 2237-2238, 2851). [20] These negotiations continued without agreement until March 3, 1950, when either a strike or a lockout ensued[7] (Tr. 2278, 2873, 4646, 4649, 6520, 6539-6540). [21] In anticipation of the fact that an agreement might not be reached, Scott had arranged to recruit non-union employees to produce the Herald under strike conditions (Tr. 2288-2290, 2293-2295, 3043, 3049). [22] Teletypesetter equipment had been arranged for by the Publishers' Association, and this permitted the production of the paper with fewer skilled employees (Tr. 2301-2303, 6067, 6071-6072, 6075-6076). [23] When the strike or lockout occurred, publication of the Herald continued under non-union conditions (Tr. 2304, 2307, 2864, 2875, 3043, 3058).

[24] In the period preceding the strike or lockout it was common knowledge in the Tri-City area that a strike or lockout at the Herald plant would occur. Parish, Bryce and others in Columbia were aware of the possibility of labor trouble at the Herald (Pl. Ex. 59).

[25] On March 14, 1950, eleven days after the strike or lockout at the Herald, Columbia, continuing with the plan that had been commenced earlier by the acquisition of sufficient plant facilities and personnel in November, 1949, commenced publication of the Co-

[7] Whether the rupture in relations between Scott and its employees was a strike or a lockout is not clear. However, which it was is immaterial to this case.

lumbia Basin News as a morning daily newspaper five days a week (later changed to six days a week) (Tr. 817-818, 983-984, 990-991, 1456).

[26] No labor agreement has ever been reached between the Herald and the union. During this long period of time the difficulties between the Herald and the union have continued (Tr. 6568, 6580). [27] As a part of the strike activities of Local 831 picket lines were established on the Herald premises, attempts were made to induce both readers and advertisers of the Herald to cease doing business with that paper. Merchants that advertised in the Herald were placed on "Do Not Patronize" lists which were distributed. Radio broadcasts were made, and other unions in the area were induced to discourage their members from patronizing the Herald (Tr. 2881-2882, 6399-6400, 6474, 6478, 6565-6566, 6568, 6575-6576, 6614, Pl. Exs. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12). [28] As the district court said: "in short all the traditional means of exerting pressure against an employer involved in a labor dispute with organized labor was engaged in"[8] (District Court Finding 48, Appendix A, p. 14A. During this same period of time competition between the Herald and the News for circulation, advertising, and general business had become increasingly keen.

[29] In the publication of the News as a bi-weekly newspaper in competition with the established daily Herald, Columbia lost money, and when it changed to a daily publication Columbia was competing not only with the Herald but with the metropolitan morning newspapers circulated in the area (Tr. 769-770, 1234, 1456-1457, 5240-5241, 5246, 5249-5251, 5287-5296, 5326-5329, Pl. Exs. 45, 46, 161, Def. Ex. 439). [30] Columbia continued to lose money, and when one of the principal backers died in July, 1950, Parish attempted

[8] 180 F.Supp. at 760.

to get financial backing from another source. This source was Unitypo, Inc. (Tr. 797, 820-825, 1297, 1462-1464, Pl. Exs. 56, 57, 161).

[31] The evidence shows that Unitypo was formed as a corporation in 1946 by the International Typographical Union. The stock of Unitypo was held by members of the executive council of the I.T.U. in trust for the membership, and funds for the operation of Unitypo were supplied by the I.T.U. from its defense fund (Tr. 4316-4320, 4323-4330, Pl. Exs. 199, 200).
[32] The evidence showed that since its inception Unitypo has started newspapers in various cities in the United States and Canada where members of the I.T.U. have become engaged in a strike or lockout with a monopoly publisher. It has also rendered encouragement and financial assistance to publishers considered friendly to labor and who were in competition with a newspaper considered unfair by the I.T.U. (Tr. 4312, 4318, 4323-4326, Pl. Ex. 388, pp. 129-143, Pl. Ex. 339, pp. 1u-32u). [33] The activities of Unitypo in various places in assisting newspapers who were competing with so-called unfair newspapers were described in a report of one of its committees as the "development of a new and practical economic defensive weapon for economic pressure on unfair employers through permanent and effective competition." (See e.g. Pl. Ex. 339, pp. 64s-65s, Pl. Ex. 340, pp. 56s-57s, Def. Ex. 422, p. 60s.)

[34] Parish had heard of the activities of the I.T.U. and Unitypo, and when the losses of Columbia continued, he sought authority from the stockholders to seek a loan from Unitypo. This authorization was obtained on June 15, 1950, but it was not until after the death of one of the principal backers of Columbia in July, 1950, that Parish contacted Unitypo in Indianapolis, asking for financial assistance (Tr. 797, 820-

825, 1462-1464, Pl. Exs. 56, 57). [35] A representative of Unitypo and of the I.T.U. was sent to Pasco to investigate. This representative, one Clarence R. Martin, who was an attorney for the I.T.U. and Unitypo, arranged for a $10,000 loan, which money was advanced to Columbia[9] (Tr. 878, 889-890, 1682, 1685-1687, Pl. Exs. 94, 95, 102, 103).

[36] The losses of Columbia continued and further loans were made or arranged by Unitypo from time to time. In one transaction the stock of Columbia was pledged to Unitypo as security (Pl. Ex. 104). [37] In 1954 Unitypo made a demand for payment. Subsequent to this demand the stock of Columbia which had been pledged as security was issued to Unitypo and Unitypo almost immediately transferred the stock to Parish and Bryce, who then redeposited the stock with Unitypo, endorsed in blank as security for the then outstanding loan (Pl. Exs. 106, 107, 108, 109, 110). [38] Also in 1952 Unitypo organized Howard Parish & Associates, Inc., a Washington corporation, and provided financing for this corporation sufficient to enable it to purchase and remodel a building which was leased and used as a plant and office by Columbia. The stock of Howard Parish & Associates, Inc., except for qualifying shares, was held by Unitypo (Tr. 1502-1506, Pl. Exs. 112, 113, 114). [39] By December 31, 1958, the indebtedness of Columbia to Unitypo had reached $1,178,000 (Pl. Ex. 116). [40] Up to this time the management of Columbia had been conducted

[9] The loan was arranged in the following manner: The Seattle-First National Bank agreed to lend $10,000 upon receipt of a note and chattel mortgage on Columbia's plant. This was immediately endorsed by the bank and assigned to Unitypo, which reimbursed the bank. The assignment to Unitypo was not recorded (Tr. 889-890, 1685-1687, Pl. Exs. 94, 95, 102, 103). The testimony showed that the reason for making the loan in this way was the prior experience of the I.T.U. and Unitypo of having the newspaper they sought to aid encounter advertisers' resistance when it became known that the paper was receiving union support (Tr. 1777-1778, 2009-2010, 4324-4325, 4347-4348, Pl. Ex. 338, p. 89).

by Parish (Tr. 1743-1744, 4548). [41] However, after December 31, 1958, Parish was replaced as manager of Columbia by one Edward Byrne, a former publisher of I.T.U. and Unitypo papers in Colorado and New York (Tr. 716-722, 725-726, 6588-6589).

Appellant contends that there has been a violation by the appellees of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 1 and 2, Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C.A. § 13(a), and Section 3 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C.A. § 14.[10] The record consists of over 7,000 pages and there are over 900 [*sic*] exhibits. The district judge in his findings of fact and legal conclusions therefrom found against appellant on all four issues. Rule 52(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that "[f]indings of fact shall not be set aside unless clearly erroneous, and due regard shall be given to the opportunity of the trial court to judge the credibility of the witnesses." As the Supreme Court stated in *United States v. United States Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948):

> "A finding is 'clearly erroneous' when although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court on the entire evidence is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed."

It is with this principle in mind that we have examined the record.

Section 1 of the Sherman Act prescribes any "contract, combination . . . or conspiracy, in restraint of trade," and Section 2 makes criminal the action of any "person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any . . . trade or commerce . . ." There was in this as in most cases no direct evidence of any contract, combination or conspiracy in restraint of trade or of any attempt to monopolize any trade; and

[10]See footnote 4.

reliance was necessarily placed on circumstantial evidence to establish appellant's claims.

The district judge, while conceding that conflicting inferences could be drawn from some of the testimany, found that no violation of Section 1 or Section 2 had been proven (Appendix A, p. 37A). He found that "the intent and purpose of Unitpyo, Inc., and I.T.U., in first assisting financially the Columbia Basin News and later taking over its publication, was simply to keep in operation in the Tri-City area a newspaper to compete with the Tri-City Herald, and was not to drive the Tri-City Herald out of business for the purpose of establishing a monopoly."[11] (Appendix A, p. 30A, Finding 133). He further found "that the purpose and intent of Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., at all times was to establish a newspaper in competition with the Tri-City Herald, and that accepting whatever financial assistance Unitypo, Inc., or I.T.U. were willing to furnish is not inconsistent with that intent and purpose."[12] (Appendix A, p. 31A, Finding 133)

There was ample testimony to support the findings of the district judge (see Ann. Op. Dist. Ct. printed as Appendix A to this petition). Much of it is referred to in the court's opinion. There was testimony that on several occasions subsequent to 1950 and up to 1954 the union by letter communicated with Scott in an attempt to resume negotiations for a labor contract; and that if Scott had been willing to accept a union contract such as the News had with Local 831, Scott's troubles with the union would have been over (Appendix A, p. 30A, Finding 132 supported by Tr. 2933-2934, 5134-5135, Def. Exs. 17, 18). While Unitypo, Inc., over a period

[11] 180 F.Supp. at 767.

[12] Ibid.

of years, advanced large sums of money to continue the publication of the Columbia Basin News, yet at no time was any offer made by Unitypo to furnish Parish or Bryce or the Columbia Basin News with funds to purchase the Herald, nor was there any evidence that at any time such a request had been made by either Parish, Bryce or Columbia Basin Publishers (Appendix A, p. 29A, Finding 129 supported by Tr. 1683-1687, Pl.Ex. 102). If there had been any intent to monopolize, the Herald probably could have been purchased for a much lesser sum of money than was advanced over the years by Unitypo (Appendix A, p. 30A, Finding 130 supported by Tr. 202-208, 2838, Pl. Exs. 4, 116). Unitypo and the I.T.U., of course, wanted to do whatever they could in order to induce the Herald to operate under union conditions. To have two newspapers in the area operating under union conditions would of course provide more work for the members of the union. Both the union and the News management were happy to receive aid from the other in the struggle each was having against the Herald (Appendix A, pp. 15A, 20A, Findings 53-56, 77-81 supported by Tr. 861, 1749-1750, 6346-6347, Pl.Exs. 37, 40, 84, as explained by Tr. 855-864, 972-975, 4777-4779, Pl.Exs. 176, Minutes of February 9, and March 4, 1950, 253, 393, 400, 484). For either side to have refused aid from the other side under the circumstances would have been highly unusual. The acceptance of such aid under the circumstances is not unlawful as long as there is no contract, combination or conspiracy to restrain trade and as long as there is no monopolizing or attempting to monopolize or a conspiracy to monopolize.

There was no evidence that the demands made by the union when they negotiated with the Herald were unreasonable, nor was there any unreasonableness on the part of the union in insisting upon a written contract

with the Herald (Appendix A, p. 11A, Findings 31, 33 supported by Tr. 2276, 3169, 3171, 3175-3176, 4600-4608, 4652-4658, 4682, 4841, 6366, 6370, 6375-6376, 6379-6387, 6507-6508, 6549-6553, 6558, 6651-6658, Pl.Ex. 176, Minutes February 9). The court found that both Scott and the union negotiated in good faith but were unable to reach an agreement (Appendix A, p. 12A, Finding 36). The policy of Unitypo in continuing to advance money for the publication of the Columbia Basin News was in line with its national policy which it had followed in other places when there was a labor dispute with a publisher in competition with another newspaper which operated under union conditions (Appendix A, pp. 23A, 24A, 28A, 30A, Findings 97-101, 126, 133 supported by Tr. 4311-4316, 4435-4438; Pl.Ex. 336, p. 109, Pl.Ex. 337, p. 103, Pl.Ex. 338, pp. 129-144, Pl.Ex. 339, pp. 63s-65s, 1u-32u, Def.Ex. 420, pp. 7-8, 6s). The difficulty that the News had in endeavoring to be a successful paper in the area, and the losses that it suffered in its efforts to succeed, are an indication of how firmly intrenched the Herald was (Appendix A, pp. 9A, 14A, 20A, Findings 19, 50, 82 supported by Tr. 769-770, 777-779, 782, 808-810, 864, 948-950, 1297, 1456-1457, 4930-4933, 5282-5283, 5462-5463, Pl.Exs. 45, 46, 116, 161).

Appellant relies upon remarks made by Parish before he established the News to the effect that he would buy the Herald out for five cents on the dollar (Appendix A, p. 8A, Finding 16 supported by Tr. 206-207, 2840-2841) and also on remarks later made by Parish, in letters written to Unitypo asking for more money to keep the News going, to the effect that they were "driving Lee and Scott Publishing Company to the wall" (Appendix A, p. 28A, Finding 124, see, e.g., Pl.Exs. 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 87, 88, 89, 96, 97, 138, 189, 497) as showing an intent to drive the Herald out of business in order to create a monopoly. However,

the court considered the circumstances under which those letters were written and held that they appeared to be "merely communications on the part of Parish and Bryce in the nature of a sales pitch to their financial angel in an effort to keep the money coming, and were no doubt received in that spirit by the I.T.U. and the Unitypo, Inc."[13] (Appendix A, p. 28A, Finding 124 supported by Tr. 910-913, 6994, 6995). Referring to the statement made by Parish prior to the time that he bought the News about Philip and Lee "having to sell their newspaper to Parish at 5c on the dollar," the court felt that Parish actually believed that by reason of his superior experience in the newspaper field and his financial backing his paper would become the dominant paper in the Tri-City area (Appendix A, p. 17A, Finding 65 supported by Dist. Ct. Findings 1-17 and references to record supporting said findings).

As further evidence of lack of proof of a conspiracy or an attempt to monopolize, it can be pointed out that within three months of the time of the strike at the Herald, Parish inserted an advertisement in a trade journal in an attempt to sell the Columbia Basin News (Appendix A, p. 22A, Finding 89 supported by Tr. 680, 690-692, Def.Ex. 42). Later in that same year, there were efforts on the part of Parish and Bryce to interest Lee in the purchase of the Columbia Basin News. Lee had an appraisal made of the News plant, and thereafter there were further negotiations between Bryce and Lee for the sale of the News to Scott (Appendix A, p. 22A, Finding 90 supported by Tr. 439, 1465-1467, 1470-1472, 3246-3253, Def.Ex. 362). These negotiations, however, resulted in no agreement for the asserted reason that Bryce insisted that as a condition of the sale the contract between the union and the Columbia Basin

[13]Id. at 766.

Publishers, Inc., would be honored (Appendix A, p 22A, Finding 91 supported by Tr. 2935-2936, 3257-3264).*

The appellant also complains of the fact that on occasions the News sold advertising space for less than the price listed on its "rate cards"; that it published a free distribution weekly known as the Columbia Basin News Shopper; that it gave the largest advertiser in the area, C. C. Anderson Company, free advertising in the Shopper; and that it reduced the rates to local advertisers on national advertising.[14] Appellant's theory is that appellees used unfair competitive methods in order to gain a monopoly position in the Tri-City area. We feel that the evidence does not support this contention. (This Finding of the Appellate Court affirms Findings 134-159 of the Trial Court, Appendix A, pp. 31A to 36A).

The district court found that while the advertising

*The court here is referring to two separate occasions on which Bryce attempted to sell the News to Lee. The first was in the summer of 1950 when Lee made an appraisal of the News plant but never contacted Bryce after making that appraisal. The secoind was a meeting between Lee and Bryce in the summer of 1951 arranged by Dudley Brown, a Seattle newspaperman. It was this second attempt which resulted in failure when Bryce insisted that a condition of the sale would be that the contract between Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. and the local unions be honored (see Appendix A, p. 22A, Findings 90 and 91).

[14]In cooperative advertising, a national advertiser, either a manufacturer or distributor of a given product, will cooperate with a local retailer in local advertising. An advertisement will be inserted in a local newspaper advertising the product and the manufacturer or distributor will reimburse the local retailer who inserts the ad for a portion of the cost of the ad. In cooperative advertising Columbia Basin News would issue double bills, one bill to the local retail merchant at his contract rate, based on the number of inches of advertising that he used in the News, and this was the bill which the local advertiser would actually pay. Columbia Basin News issued a second bill to the local merchant to be submitted to the national advertiser for reimbursement at the open rate which in most instances would be higher than the local merchant's contract rate. In this way the local merchant would receive reimbursement for a higher proportion of the bill for the given ad than the national advertiser had agreed to pay (Tr. 1331, 1430, 1434, 3986-3993, 4197-4211, 4212-4228).

rates originally set by the News were not always followed, these rates were "totally unrealistic" when the comparative circulation of the News and the Herald was considered, and that the rates charged were not "unreasonably low" compared to the advertising rates of the Herald with its larger circulation.[15] (Appendix A, p. 31A, Findings 134-136 supported by Tr. 576-577, 3004, 3096, 5775-5776, Pl.Exs. 2, 32, 145-160, 391, 491, Def.Exs. 352-357). In March, 1951, the News revised its rate tags and thereafter "rates charged advertisers did not substantially deviate"[16] from the published rates (Appendix A, p. 31A, Finding 138 supported by Tr. 576-577, 3003, 5598, 5601-5604, Pl.Exs. 145-156). The evidence would indicate that the News had originally set the price that it would charge advertisers unrealistically high, and that there was a period of deviation from the published rates while management determined what price could be charged (Appendix A, p. 31A, Findings 134, 137 supported by Tr. 576-577, 5775-5776). In this connection it is well to remember that Parish and his associates probably grossly underestimated the strength of the Herald when they decided to move into the Tri-City area, and it is easy to understand an initial period of instability while the paper attempted to adjust its policies to the realities of the situation[17] (Appendix A, p. 21A, Finding 87 supported by Tr. 864, Pl.Ex. 161).

---

[15]The circulation of the Herald at all times exceeded that of the News.

[16]180 F.Supp. at 767.

[17]We do not feel that *Union Leader Corp. v. Newspapers of New England*, 180 F.Supp. 125 (D.Mass. 1960), modified, 284 F.2d 582 (1st Cir. 1960), is applicable to the situation now before this court. In *Union Leader* the court was faced with an area that was capable of supporting only one daily newspaper; the evidence before us establishes that the Tri-City area is capable of supporting two newspapers. The consistent unjustified deviation from published rates that was present in *Union Leader* is not present in this case. We feel that the factual situation in *Union Leader* so differs from the factual situation presented by

The court found that the publication of a free distribution paper, such as the Shopper, in an attempt to get complete area coverage is not an uncommon practice in the newspaper business (Appendix A, p. 32A, Finding 143 supported by Tr. 2997). Concerning the free advertising given Anderson, the record shows that Anderson, the News' biggest advertiser, had advertised mostly on Fridays, resulting in an unbalanced paper. In consideration of Anderson's advertising in the News for a five-day period, Anderson was given free advertising in the Shopper (Appendix A, pp. 32A-33A, Finding 146 supported by Tr. 1144-1146, 1373). We see nothing wrong with this practice as it existed in this case. In any case the Herald was not harmed, for the evidence establishes that because of unfriendly feelings between the Anderson Company manager and Glenn Lee, publisher of the Herald, Anderson would not have placed any advertising in the Herald and would have advertised in any event in the News exclusively. It would appear from the record that the fact that the Herald did not get any advertising was due solely to the animosity between the two men and not to the business practices of the News (Appendix A, p. 32A, Finding 145 supported by Tr. 3177-3178, 3183-3184, 3189, 3444-3449, Def.Exs. 372, 488).

In considering the action of the News during the period in question, the court found that "[a]lmost all of the devices, including the cooperative advertising practice, the publication of the Columbia Basin News Shopper, the giving of more favorable rates to larger advertisers, and the free distribution of newspapers,

---

this case that no benefit can be gained by torturing either until it fits the bed of the other. We are here dealing with inferences that could have been drawn from the facts that were presented to the trial judge, and the fact that Judge Wyzanski drew one set of inferences in the case before him does not mean that the evidence in this case does not support the inferences drawn by Judge Murray.

used by Columbia Basin News in this competitive struggle and of which plaintiff complains, were at one time or another throughout the period here in question used by the Tri-City Herald in this competitive struggle (Appendix A, p. 34A, Finding 149 supported by Tr. 2917-2920, 5586-5591). In addition, Tri-City Herald used devises such as rebates to advertisers and payments of commissions to local advertising agencies on local display advertising to attract advertising, which were not used by Columbia Basin News"[18] (Appendix A, p. 34A, Finding 150 supported by Tr. 3083, 3113-3115, 3120, 3129, 3132, 3136, 3149, 5149-5162, 5310, 5857, Def.Ex. 473). The Court considered the effect on the Herald of its long struggle with the union and with the News. At first the Herald lost both advertising and circulation revenue (Appendix A, p. 35A, Finding 152 supported by Tr. 250-252, 2890-2891, 2956, Pl.Exs. 2, 383). When the strike started, the Herald's cost increased by virtue of the high wages and overtime paid to the imported non-union labor (Appendix A, p. 35A, Finding 153, Tr. 233, 3299, 3309, 3312-3315, Def.Ex. 487(b)). However, as time went on and employees were trained, the costs were reduced and eventually became less than what they had been before the strike commenced (Appendix A, p. 35A, Finding 154 supported by Tr. 3315-3317). By September, 1950, wage cuts had been eliminated. During the following year raises were granted officers of the Herald and its financial condition has continued to improve.[19] (Appendix A, p. 35A, Finding 155 supported by Def.Ex. 487c). The court found that "the Tri-City Herald at all times material has been and continues to be the dominant newspaper

---

[18]180 F.Supp. at 768.

[19]Dividends on the stock of Scott were paid in 1953, 1954, 1956, 1957 and 1958. Salaries of officers were raised over the years and bonuses to officers were paid occasionally.

in the Tri-City area."[20] (Appendix A, p. 35A, Finding 157 supported by Tr. 3087, 3483-3484, 3588, Pl.Exs. 2, 491, Def.Exs. 351, 376). The appellant in its brief states "[T]he record in this case is uncontradicted that the Tri-City area is capable of sustaining two newspapers." (See Appellant's Brief in court of appeals, p. 58, footnote.)

Appellant contends that the evidence demanded a finding of conspiracy to drive the Herald out of business and of an attempt on the part of the News to create a monopoly. It wishes us to draw inferences from the testimony contrary to those drawn by the trial judge. The district judge had the opportunity to see and to hear all the many witnesses and to evaluate their testimony. After the lengthy trial the district judge in his opinion stated as follows:

> "[T]he Court finds that the intent and purpose of Unitypo, Inc., and I.T.U., in first assisting financially the Columbia Basin News and later taking over its publication, was simply to keep in operation in the Tri-City area a newspaper to compete with the Tri-City Herald, and was not to drive the Tri-City Herald out of business for the purpose of establishing a monopoly. The Court further finds that the purpose and intent of Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., at all times was to establish a newspaper in competition with the Tri-City Herald, and that accepting whatever financial assistance Unitypo, Inc., or I.T.U. were willing to furnish is not inconsistent with that intent and purpose.[21]
>
> * * *
>
> "In this case the evidence does not show either an actual restraint of trade or a monopoly, or the specific intent on the part of any of the defendants, either individually or in combination, to restrain

[20] 180 F.Supp. at 769.

[21] Id. at 767.

trade or create a monopoly in the daily newspaper business in the Tri-City area."[22]

While it may be contended that if the district court had made other and different findings in reference to a conspiracy we might have been forced to uphold them, he, however, had the primary duty to draw the inferences and to make the findings; and we cannot say after a review of the extensive record that the findings of the district judge as to absence of violations of Section 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act were clearly erroneous.

We now give our attention to the claimed violation of Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C.A. § 13(a). The district court found that there were no price discriminations by Columbia Basin News in the sale of advertising which had the effect of lessing competition or which tended to create a monopoly or to injure, destroy or prevent competition. The appellant contends that the record shows that there were some price differences between rates charged by Columbia Basin News to one advertiser from those charged to other advertisers. This, however, in itself is not sufficient to show a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In *Balian Ice Cream Co. v. Arden Farms Co.*, 231 F.2d 356, 367 (9th Cir. 1955), this court said:

> "It is also broadly stated in the argument that a differential in price in and of itself constitutes discrimination within the meaning of § 2(a) of the Clayton Act, as amended.
>
> "But this postulate is universal, arrived at with insufficient bases. 'Congress was dealing with competition, which it sought to protect, and monopoly, which it sought to prevent.' There is no presumption set up anywhere that merely because there is

[22]Id. at 770.

> a differential in various areas, necessarily a price discrimination exists." [Footnote omitted].

In *FTC v. Anheuser-Busch, Inc.*, 363 U.S. 536, 553 (1960), the Supreme Court said:

> "What we have said makes it quite evident, we believe, that our decision does not raise the specter of a flat prohibition of price differentials, inasmuch as price differences constitute but one element of a § 2(a) violation."

The language of the Act provides that a discrimination in price is unlawful "where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce." The district court found against appellant and there is substantial evidence to justify the finding (Appendix A, p. 38A, Finding 160, supported by Tr. 2917-2920, 3087, 3483-3484, 3588, 5586-5591, Pl.Exs. 2, 491, 492, 493, Def.Exs. 351, 376, 487(*c*)). As indicated above the evidence shows and the court found that the Herald has been at all times the dominant newspaper in the area (Appendix A, p. 35A, Finding 157 supported by Tr. 3087, 3483-3484, 3588, Pl. Exs. 2, 491, Def.Exs. 351, 376). The News was a newcomer battling against the thoroughly established Herald. The Herald has significantly more lineage than the News (Def.Exs. 351, 376). The Herald circulation always exceeded the News (Pl.Exs. 2, 491). The circulation of the Herald did drop approximately 10% after the strike of March, 1950, but this is explained by reason of the labor difficulties of the Herald and by reason of the fact that there was a new daily newspaper in the area (Appendix A, p. 35A, Findings 152, 156 supported by Tr. 250-252, 2890-2891, 2956, Pl.Exs. 2, 383). Some loss of circulation continued during the remainder of 1950 and 1951, but by February of 1952 the circulation exceeded that of April, 1950 (the month following the strike), and it continued to grow thereafter until in June of 1959 the daily circula-

tion was 15,413, and the Sunday circulation was over 16,000 (Pl.Ex. 2). An examination of the advertising in the Herald discloses a steady increase in lineage (Def.Ex. 351). In an advertisement put out by the Herald in 1957, the statement was made that "THE TRI-CITY HERALD'S Consistent Advertising Lead Continues to Widen the Gap in 1957" (Def.Ex. 376). The chart advertised at that time showed that from 1951 to 1957 there had been a very substantial increase in the amount of advertising carried by the Herald and that from 1955 on to 1957 the advertising in the Columbia Basin News had gone steadily downward. In the same advertisement the statement was made that "The TRI-CITY HERALD Leads in Total Advertising Lineage on better than a 2 to 1 margin over the second paper."[23] A comparison of the total advertising lineage of the Herald and the News from 1951 through the first six months of 1959 shows the following figures:

---

[23]Another advertisement attached to the above mentioned statement reads as follows:

"The FACTS!

LOOK AT THE HERALD'S ADVERTISING LEAD!
In the important TRI-CITY MARKET
the HERALD PUBLISHES

69% of all AUTOMOTIVE DISPLAY
65% of all DRAPERIES and FLOOR COVERINGS
63% of all DRUG STORE DISPLAY
75% of all FURNITURE DISPLAY
69% of all HARDWARE and APPLIANCES
64% of all GROCERY DISLAY
65% of all JEWELRY DISPLAY
73% of all LUMBER YARD DISPLAY
79% of all MEN'S WEAR DISPLAY
71% of all SHOE STORE DISPLAY
63% of all WOMEN'S WEAR DISPLAY
64% of all CLASSIFIED AUTOMOTIVE
64% of all REAL ESTATE — CLASSIFIED
64% of all LOCAL DISPLAY
70% of all NATIONAL DISPLAY
63% of all TOTAL ADVERTISING
82.4% COVERAGE OF ALL OCCUPIED DWELLINGS

Tri-City Herald			Columbia Basin News	
1951	378,848		1951	185,681
1952	418,172		1952	226,376
1953	494,907		1953	305,812
1954	535,998		1954	338,877
1955	600,190		1955	343,317
1956	514,869		1956	317,772
1957	538,297		1957	310,418
1958	527,712		1958	281,467
1959	253,459	(First six months)	1959	128,799

From all the evidence it appears that the Herald grew demonstrably during the years in question. The language of the Court in *Times-Picayune Publishing Co. v. United States*, 345 U.S. 594, 621 (1953), is appropriate to the situation presented here:

> "The Item, the alleged victim of the Times-Picayune Company's challenged trade practices, appeared, in short, to be doing well.
>
> "The record in this case thus does not disclose evidence from which demonstrably deleterious effects on competition may be inferred."

Without discussing the details of the claimed price difference relied upon by appellant, we find that there was substantial evidence in the record to justify the finding of the district court that there were no price discriminations by Columbia Basin News in the sale of advertising which had the effect of lessening competition or which tended to create a monopoly or injure, destroy or prevent competition.[24]

The complaint also charged a violation of Section 3 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C.A. § 14. The district court found that "[n]o advertising was sold in the Columbia

[24]The claim is also made by appellee that advertising in not a commodity and does not come within the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. The district court did not reach this issue, and in view of our finding that the evidence supports the judgment of the district court, we do not feel it necessary to reach this issue either.

Basin News or the Columbia Basin News Shopper, and no rates for advertising in either or both were fixed, upon any understanding or agreement that the advertiser would not advertise in the Tri-City Herald or any other advertising media in the area."[25] (Appendix A. p. 36A, Finding 158, supported by Tr. 1203, 1373). Appellants have not argued this violation in their brief, nor have they pointed to any evidence claimed to support the charge in the complaint. We shall therefore not discuss it.

We believe there was ample evidence in the record to support the district court's findings that there were no violations on the part of appellees of either Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act, or Section 3 of the Clayton Act.

The judgment is affirmed.

(Endorsed) Opinion Filed June 30, 1961.

FRANK H. SCHMID, *Clerk*

[25] 180 F.Supp. at 769.

APPENDIX C

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, NORTHERN DIVISION

SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., INC., *Plaintiff*,
vs.
COLUMBIA BASIN PUBLISHERS, INC., *et al.*, *Defendants*,
and
ALLIED STORES CORPORATION, *et al.*, *Additional Defendants*.

ORDER

CIVIL ACTION No. 4030

Endorsed: Filed in the United States District Court, Western District of Washington, Northern Division, July 27, 1959. Harold W. Anderson, Clerk.

By.....Deputy.

Pursuant to Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the attorneys for all parties are directed to attend a pre-trial conference at 10:00 A.M., on Thursday, August 13, 1959, at the chambers of Judge Bowen, in the United States Court House building, in the City of Seattle, Washington.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that prior to said pre-trial conference, and on or before the 11th day of August, 1959, the attorneys for each party shall file with the Clerk and serve on the opposing party a typewritten memorandum covering each of the items as are appropriate in accordance with the list hereto attached.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel, herein, on or before the 6th day of August, 1959, meet together to exchange the information required by this order, and to do other things necessary to effect the purposes of this order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of this court

forthwith notify the attorneys of record for the respective parties of the making of this order.

Done and dated this 24th day of July, 1959.

W. D. MURRAY
United States District Judge.

(1) A brief statement of what the plaintiff expects to prove in support of his claim.

(2) A brief statement of what the defendant expects to prove as a defense.

(3) Similar statements as to any counterclaim or cross-claim of a defendant.

(4) A brief statement of the points of law and a citation of the authorities in support of each point upon which such party intends to rely at the trial.

(5) Any amendments required of the pleadings.

(6) Any tender of issue in the pleadings that is to be abandoned.

(7) Any stipulation of facts, as to liability or damages, that the attorney is willing to make, or on which he requests an admission.

(8) The details of the damages claimed, or of any other relief sought, as of the date of the pre-trial conference.

(9) A list of all exhibits such party expects to offer at the trial, with a description of each exhibit sufficient for identification, the purpose for which offered, and specifying those which will be conceded to be genuine or as to which a concession is requested.

(10) The names and addresses of all witness to be called at the trial and the specialties of experts to be called as witnesses.

(11) Any other pre-trial relief which the attorney will request.

No. 4030

[Title of Court and Cause]

BRIEF STATEMENT OF WHAT PLAINTIFF INTENDS TO PROVE

Pursuant to the Order of the Honorable W. D. Murray, United States District Judge, entered July 24, 1959, in the above entitled Court, plaintiff herewith makes a brief statement of what plaintiff expects to prove in support of plaintiff's complaint. This memorandum is divided into two parts. The first section sets forth the facts which will be proved by plaintiff as related to certain legal principles. The second section sets forth a brief statement of facts in narrative form.

FIRST SECTION

1. That sometime in 1949 and prior thereto, the defendants Howard W. Parish and James M. Bryce with others entered into a combination plan or agreement to restrain trade and commerce in the sale of news and advertising in interstate commerce in the daily newspaper publishing business in Pasco, Kennewick, Richland, Washington, and the surrounding area known as the Tri-City area.

2. At sometime in 1949 or prior thereto the defendants Howard W. Parish and James M. Bryce with others entered into a conspiracy to restrain trade and commerce in the sale of news and advertising in interstate commerce and the daily newspaper publishing business in interstate commerce in Pasco, Kennewick and Richland, Washington, and the surrounding area known as Tri-City area.

3. That the defendants have attempted to monopolize trade and commerce in the sale of news and advertising in interstate commerce and in the daily newspaper publishing business in Kennewick, Pasco and

Richland, Washington, and the surrounding area known as the Tri-City area.

4. That the defendants have conspired to attempt to monopolize trade and commerce in the sale of news and advertising in interstate commerce and in the daily newspaper publishing business in Pasco, Kennewick and Richland, Washington, and the surrounding area known as the Tri-City area.

5. That the combination, plan and agreement and the conspiracy above set forth commenced sometime in 1949 between and among the defendants Howard W. Parish and James M. Bryce and others and thereafter acts were done in pursuance thereof by the defendants Howard W. Parish and James M. Bryce, the Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc.; and the defendants International Typographical Union, Walter D. Marvick and Kennewick-Pasco Typographical Union, Local 831 and Seattle Typographical Union, Local 202 joined in said conspiracy sometime in the latter part of 1949 and prior to March 3, 1950, and did and performed acts pursuant to agreement with defendants Howard Parish, James Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., in furtherance thereof; and

6. That the defendant Unitypo, Inc. joined in said conspiracy sometime on or about or after June, 1950, and pursuant to agreement with the defendants Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., International Typographical Union, Kennewick-Pasco Typographical Union, Local 831 and Seattle Typographical Union, Local 202 in furtherance of said conspiracy and combination plan and agreement to restrain trade and to attempt to monopolize, as above set forth; and

7. That the defendants Francis R. McGlothlin and A. L. Wilie sometime in the year 1955 joined said con-

spiracy and pursuant to agreement did act in furtherance thereof; and

8. That the defendants Randolph, Hurd, Lyons, Clark and Bailey joined said conspiracy at the time the International Typographical Union joined the same as set forth in paragraph 6 and did act in furtherance thereof; and

9. That plaintiff is engaged in interstate commerce in the business of selling news and advertising and publishing a daily newspaper; and

10. That the defendant Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. is engaged in interstate commerce in the business of selling news and advertising and publishing a daily newspaper; and

11. That the defendants Unitypo, Inc. and International Typographical Union are engaged in interstate commerce; and

12. That the acts of the defendants constitute the following:

(a) A contract and conspiracy in restraint of trade and attempt to monopolize the daily newspaper publishing business and combination and conspiracy to monopolize; and

(b) A contract and conspiracy to discriminate and discrimination in price among purchasers of advertising and like kind and quality with the effect of lessening competition and attempting to create a monopoly and injure, destroy and prevent competition; and

(c) A contract and conspiracy to sell subscription to the news and advertising at prices lower in the Tri-City area than elsewhere; to destroy competition and eliminate plaintiff and to sell subscriptions and advertising space at unreasonably low prices to eliminate plaintiff and destroy competition; and

(d) A contract and conspiracy to sell advertising in the Tri-City area in connection with the advertising of nationally advertised products at prices higher to the advertisers of such products not receiving a double bill than was charged to other advertisers; and

(e) An agreement to sell advertising in the Columbia Basin News and Shopper in combination on condition that the purchaser will not advertise in the Tri-City Herald with the effect of lessening competition and attempting to create a monopoly; and

13. That by reason of the acts complained of competition was in fact lessened, trade and commerce in the sale of news and advertising was lessened and unreasonably restrained; that such acts interfered with the free exercise of plaintiff's right to engage in trade and commerce in selling news and advertising in local as well as interstate commerce; and

14. That the acts of the defendants tended to foster, establish and create a monopoly and destroy competition in the newspaper publishing business in the Tri-City area and to foster a monopoly and destroy competition in trade and commerce in news and advertising in interstate commerce; and

15. That the plaintiff was injured and damaged as a result of the acts of the defendants in the amounts as set forth in plaintiff's second amended complaint, plaintiff's supplemental complaint and as will be set forth in the second supplemental complaint.

SECOND SECTION

The Parties:

(1) *Plaintiff—Scott Publishing Co., Inc.:*

Plaintiff is a Washington corporation, organized in September, 1947, which since October, 1947, publishes the Tri-City Herald six days a week (excluding Saturday). It was organized by R. F. Philip and Glenn C. Lee, presently president and secretary-treasurer, respectively, of plaintiff and Hugh Scott who is no longer connected with plaintiff corporation.

(2) *Defendant—Columbia Basin Publisher, Inc.:*

This defendant is a Washington corporation, organized in August, 1949, and since March 14, 1950, it publishes the daily Columbia Basin News six days a week (excluding Sunday). Since January, 1952, this defendant has published the Columbia Basin News Shopper which is distributed free in the Tri-City area once a week. Its original stockholders were Parish, Bryce and a number of wealthy, prominent Seattle businessmen, which stock was pledged to defendant Unitypo, Inc., in November, 1950, and in February, 1951, as security for loans then totalling $50,000, which pledge was allegedly forfeited without notice in December, 1954. The stock was later purportedly resold to Parish and Bryce, without personal fixed obligation to pay, for a price equal to the amount of loans to Unitypo, Inc., no part of which has been paid. The printing press and equipment with which the Columbia Basin Publishers publishes its daily newspaper and its weekly shopper is owned by the defendant Unitypo, Inc. and the building in which such equipment is housed is in Pasco, Washington, leased to Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. by its owner, Howard Parish and Associates, a Washington corporation, defendant hereafter described, the capital stock of which is owned by defendant Unitypo, Inc.

(3) *Defendant—Howard Parish and Associates, Inc.:*

This defendant is a Washington corporation, formed on or about August, 1952, with authorized capital of $50,000 subscribed and paid for and issued to the defendant Unitypo, Inc. except for qualifying shares held by Howard W. Parish, its president and director, James M. Bryce, vice-president and director, and Joseph A. Barto, secretary-treasurer, and director (of Lundin, Barto and Goucher, counsel of record for this and other defendants). It was organized for the purpose of acquiring the land and building for lease to Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. providing expanded facilities in which to publish the Columbia Basin News. Since its inception in 1952, this corporation received notes from Columba Basin Publishers, Inc. for the rent of its building and machinery. To date, none of these notes have been paid.

(4) *Defendant—Unitypo, Inc.:*

Unitypo, Inc. is a New York corporation, organized ostensibly for profit, and the capital stock is owned by the defendant International Typographical Union (herein at times referred to as "ITU"), and hereafter described, being held by the members of the Executive Council of the ITU (the governing body of the ITU) in trust for the ITU members; its officers and directors are the same as the officers and members of the Executive Council of the defendant ITU, except for a resident director in New York State. Officers and directors other than the New York State resident director act without extra compensation. Unitypo, Inc. was incorporated with funds of the ITU and its working capital needs are obtained by loans from the ITU which loans have amounted to millions of dollars. Unitypo, Inc. purchased from the defendant Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "Columbia"), in August, 1950, for the price of $25,000 the

printing press and equipment used in publishing the Columbia Basin News (hereafter sometimes referred to as the "News") and the Columbia Basin News Shopper. Commencing in November, 1951, and to date, Unitypo, Inc. has loaned to Columbia from time to time amounts in excess of $1,250,000 without security other than the pledge of stock of Columbia, as heretofore mentioned, securing only the first two loans totalling $50,000. This defendant is by reason of its activities engaged in interstate commerce.

(5) *Defendant — International Typographical Union (referred to as "ITU"):*

This defendant is a labor organization with headquarters in Indianapolis, Indiana, with more than 100,000 members who are employees of newspaper publishing and commercial printing plants throughout the United States and Canada, and whose governing body is the Executive Council, consisting of the president, first, second and third vice-presidents and the secretary-treasurer.

This defendant has subordinate local union affiliates which include the defendants Seattle Typographical Union, Local 202 and Kennewick-Pasco Typographical Union, Local 831. The defendants Woodruff Randolph, Walter C. Marvick, Charles M. Lyon, Joe Bailey, Francis R. McGlothlin and A. L. Wilie are members of the ITU as were the named defendants Don Hurd, Charles M. Lyon and Harold H. Clark, now deceased. ITU and Unitypo have published or provided funds for the publication of daily as well as weekly newspapers throughout the United States and Canada which at times have been approximately 20 in number and which include the Columbia Basin News published by Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. In excess of $25,000,000 of ITU funds collected from its membership as dues and assessments has been expended for this purpose since 1946, of which

approximately $1,250,000 by way of loans and another $100,000 for land, buildings and equipment, have been made available to defendants Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. in order to insure continued publication of the Columbia Basin News in furtherance of and as part of the conspiracy against the plaintiff hereafter mentioned.

(6) *Defendants Kennewick-Pasco Typographical Union Local 831, Seattle Typographical Union Local 202 and Allied Printing Trades Council:*

Local 831 and Local 202 are affiliated with the defendant ITU and engaged respectively in activities on behalf of their members in the Tri-City area consisting of Kennewick, Pasco and Richland as to Local 831 and Seattle as to Local 202; Allied Printing Trades Council of Seattle is a labor organization with which Local 202 and its members are affiliated; defendants have and do act as agents for the ITU and Unitypo, Inc., in respect to furthering the business of the ITU and Unitypo, Inc. in the State of Washington, particularly in respect to the newspaper publishing and printing activities of the defendants. These defendants are parties to the conspiracy against plaintiff by reason of the activities hereafter set forth.

(7) *Individual defendants Howard Parish, James M. Bryce, Woodruff Randolph, Don Hurd, Joe Bailey, Harold H. Clark, Charles M. Lyon, Walter C. Marvick, Francis R. McGlothlin and A. L. Wilie:*

Parish and Bryce are the principal members and the dominating force in the original conspiracy against plaintiff and are and have been officers and directors of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. and Howard Parish and Associates, Inc. Defendants Randolph, Hurd, Bailey, Clark and Lyon were members of the ITU and of its Executive Council during the relevant period and were officers and directors and shareholders of

Unitypo, Inc. Defendant Walter C. Marvick is a resident of Bremerton, Washington, and has been a representative of the ITU since the latter part of 1949. Defendant Francis R. McGlothlin is a member of the ITU and president of Local 202 at the time this action was commenced. Defendant A. L. Wilie is a member of the ITU and a former officer of Local 202 and secretary-treasurer of Allied Printing Trades Council when this action was commenced. By reason of the activities hereafter set forth the individual defendants are parties to the conspiracy against plaintiff.

The Conspiracy:

(1) *Defendants Parish, Bryce, Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. and Local 831:*

Defendants Parish and Bryce together with certain substantial Seattle businessmen who became stockholders of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. upon its formation formed a plan, combination or agreement to engage in the publication of a daily newspaper in the Kennewick-Pasco-Richland area (hereafter referred to sometimes as "Tri-City area"). From the beginning of the operation, Parish and Bryce intended to destroy the plaintiff and to establish a monopoly in the Tri-City area. On occasion, Parish threatened representatives of the Herald and announced his purpose to drive plaintiff out of business or to force it to merge with their planned publication. Columbia Basin Publishers started a weekly, which subsequently was converted to a bi-weekly, paper in the Tri-City area. Commencing March 14, 1950, the Columbia Basin News was published as a daily. By the end of April, 1950, operating losses were approximately $52,000.

Despite such losses, in the early part of 1950, or late 1949, Parish and Bryce individually and on behalf of Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. entered into a plan

and agreement with the Union whereby unreasonable demands were made by the ITU for higher wages and shorter hours from the Tri-City Herald, which would force it into bankruptcy if met, or result in a strike if not met. A strike of the Herald by Local 831 was authorized by the ITU in February, 1950, and was executed by the local union on March 3, 1950. The strike was called with an understanding and agreement between the Unions and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. that Parish would promptly commence publication of a daily newspaper and thus provide employment to ITU members to supplement strike benefits during the strike.

(2) *News financial condition; Unitypo enters the conspiracy:*

After daily publication commenced, the News continued to sustain substantial operating losses and Parish could not obtain needed financial support from stockholders. Sometime before June 15, 1950, Parish and Bryce approached the ITU and Unitypo and solicited and obtain financial support for the News. At the time of the original loan arrangements and throughout the years, Parish and Bryce made clear to the Union defendants, and these defendants agreed, that the purpose for the use of Union funds was the destruction of the Tri-City Herald. Throughout the relevant period, Parish, Bryce and other representatives of the News continuously furnished complete and detailed information and reports as to the progress and financial condition of the News and also of the Herald to the Union defendants; and the Union defendants participated in the operations of the Columbia Basin News. The News increased in circulation and advertising revenue at the expense of the Herald. Yet the News' operating costs and losses mounted increasingly throughout the years.

Joint Techniques of Defendants to Destroy the Herald and to Create a Monopoly

(1) The efforts of Parish and Bryce to obtain advertising and circulation for the News were coordinated with the strike activity of the ITU and Local 831 against the Herald.

(2) Strike ads were run in the News both with and without charge, against the Herald.

(3) Joint radio programs sponsored by the News and Local 831 were broadcast.

(4) Subscriptions to the News were sold directly to an agent representing Local 831, and such subscriptions were delivered free to local residents.

(5) Joint conferences and meetings were held between representatives of the ITU, Local 831 and the Columbia Basin News to plan means of increasing the circulation and advertising linage of the News and taking circulation and advertising away from the Herald.

Techniques of Union Defendants in Furtherance of the Conspiracy and Agreement

(1) Defendants McGlothlin and Wilie, individually and in behalf of Local 202 and Allied Printing Trades Council, visited advertising agencies and advertisers in Seattle to discourage the placement of national advertising in the Tri-City Herald and to encourage the placement of national advertising in the Columbia Basin News.

(2) McGlothlin wrote letters to advertisers in Seattle to discourage the placement of advertising in the Tri-City Herald and to encourage the placement of advertising in the Columbia Basin News.

(3) Defendants ITU and Unitypo agreed to assist

and have assisted Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc. by providing continuous financial assistance and equipment and through formation of Howard Parish and Associates, Inc., which provided expanded newspaper publishing plant facilities for publication of the Columbia Basin News.

(4) The picketing against the Tri-City Herald continued from and after the date of the strike continuously through 1952 and thereafter continuously at the Richland office of the Tri-City Herald and intermittently at the Kennewick office to the present time.

(5) Local 831 published and distributed printed strike material and literature throughout the Tri-City area to discourage the buying, subscribing to, reading of and placement of advertising in the Tri-City Herald.

(6) Local 831 boycotted and urged others to boycott merchants who placed advertising in the Tri-City Herald.

(7) The Union defendants wrote letters and made calls upon advertisers and national advertising agencies to discourage the placement of advertising in the Tri-City Herald, and to encourage the placement of advertising in the Columbia Basin News.

Techniques and Methods of Defendants Parish, Bryce and Columbia Basin Publishers, Inc., in Furtherance of the Conspiracy and Agreement to Establish a Monopoly

(1) The Columbia Basin News sold advertising at rates which were discriminations in price, directly and indirectly, among and between different purchasers of such advertising in order to create a monopoly by destroying the Herald.

(2) The News gave free advertising in the News Shopper to the C. C. Anderson Co. for a period of five

years and to certain other advertisers spasmodically, which was not offered or given on proportionately equal terms to all advertisers.

(3) These defendants gave special secret discounts and rebates by credit memoranda to some advertisers which were not given and offered to other purchasers of similar advertising; and different special secret discounts and rebates were given to different purchasers.

(4) The News gave double bills for advertising purchased by local merchants in cooperation with the distributor and/or manufacturer of nationally advertised products. Such double billing was in effect a net price discrimination in favor of certain local merchants.

(5) The News published advertising rate cards containing rates that were unreasonably low and below cost.

(6) Advertising charges actually made to purchasers of advertising were at rates further below cost and unreasonably low and discriminatory.

(7) Secret discounts and rebates had the effect of reducing advertising charges to purchasers of advertising still further below cost.

(8) The discriminatory, unreasonably low and below cost rates and secret rates and discounts were offered and given when the News incurred substantial operating loss and when the sole source of sufficient working capital to continue publication of the News was the ITU and Unitypo; all of which was kept secret from the News employees with one or two exceptions and from the public both within and without the Tri-City area.

(9) The business of publishing the Columbia Basin News was conducted continuously at a loss.

(10) The News was distributed free in Richland pursuant to agreement with the C. C. Anderson Co. to give complete coverage of Richland in exchange for exclusive advertising in the Columbia Basin News.

(11) The News was distributed free in Kennewick and Pasco for the sole purpose of building and developing circulation and advertising for the News and depriving the Herald of circulation and advertising revenues.

(12) Subscriptions to the News were sold at unreasonably low rates and below cost and at special reduced prices.

(13) The News Shopper was distributed free as a tool to attract advertisers and circulation so that such advertisers and readers would not buy, subscribe, read or place advertising in the Tri-City Herald.

(14) Granted unusual credit terms to advertisers in order to induce continued placement of advertising in the News and not in the Herald.

The Union defendants knew of, participated in and actively encouraged each of the above listed techniques.

Respectfully submitted,

CARL A. JONSON
JOHNSON, DAFOE & JONSON
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED

NOV 24 1961

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1961

No. 512

SCOTT PUBLISHING CO., INC.,
Petitioner,
vs.
COLUMBIA BASIN PUBLISHERS, INC.; HOWARD PARISH AND ASSOCIATES, INC.; HOWARD W. PARISH; JAMES M. BRYCE; KENNEWICK-PASCO TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 831; UNITYPO, INC.; INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION; WOODRUFF RANDOLPH; DON HURD; WALTER D. MARVICK; CHARLES M. LYON; HAROLD H. CLARK; JOE BAILEY; FRANCIS E. McGLOTHLIN; A. L. WILIE; SEATTLE TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 202; and ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL OF SEATTLE,
Respondents.

Reply Brief in Support of Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

HERBERT W. CLARK
ROBERT D. RAVEN
HOWARD M. DOWNS
Eleventh Floor, Crocker Building
San Francisco 4, California

CARL A. JONSON
400 Central Building
Seattle 4, Washington

Attorneys for Petitioner

JOHNSON, JONSON & INSLEE
400 Central Building
Seattle 4, Washington

MORRISON, FOERSTER, HOLLOWAY
SHUMAN & CLARK
Eleventh Floor, Crocker Building
San Francisco 4, California

Of Counsel.

SORG PRINTING COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA 180 FIRST STREET, SAN FRANCISCO 5